PERSONALITY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND EFFECTIVENESS OF REGIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM CONSULTANTS IN FLORIDA

BY

ARTHUR BURTON HASELTINE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1982

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author recognizes with gratitude the support given by those who contributed to this study.

Sincere appreciation goes to the members of the supervisory committee, Dr. Ralph B. Kimbrough, chairman, without whose support and guidance the completion of this project would not have been possible, and to the other members, Dr. James W. Hensel and Dr. Phillip A. Clark for their advice and timely suggestions.

Special thanks are due Dr. Mary H. McCaulley, director of the Center for Applications of Psychological Type, for her counsel and assistance and for the use of the CAPT resources, and to Dr. John M. Nickens for his advice and help in handling the statistical data.

The study could not have been completed without the participation of the personnel of the Vocational Division of the Florida Department of Education. Thanks go to the administrators who permitted the study and to all the voluntary participants whose commitment of time and interest contributed to its accomplishment. Special recognition and appreciation go to Mrs. Valeria Mason for her continuing encouragement and support.

To all others who contributed in various ways the author is grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PERSONALITY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND EFFECTIVENESS OF REGIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM CONSULTANTS IN FLORIDA

By

Arthur Burton Haseltine

August, 1982

Chairman: Dr. Ralph B. Kimbrough
Major Department: Educational Administration and Supervision

The study utilized the psychological type theory of C. G. Jung to examine the personalities of regional vocational education program consultants. The researcher theorized that this highly specialized group of educators differed in personality type from comparable groups, and that differences in personality type could explain the variance in role performance between more effective and less effective consultants. Relationships between job satisfaction, personality, and effectiveness were also investigated.

Self-report instruments were used to gather data on personality types and job satisfaction from a sample (N=45) of consultants in the five regional offices of the Vocational Division in Florida. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, which enables individuals to indicate their

preferred mode of operation within Jung's typology, was used to identify personality, and a researcher-developed Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) recorded feelings of job satisfaction. The JSQ considered work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers—the five areas used in the development of the Job Descriptive Index by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin in their Cornell University studies.

Role effectiveness was determined by the administrators of the regional offices who supervised and evaluated the consultants.

Chi-square and Fisher's Exact Probability statistics were used for personality comparisons and point biserial correlation coefficients for tests of associations.

The data led to the following conclusions:

1. Consultants as a group were extraverted (E), sensing (S), and highly thinking (T) and judging (J).

2. Consultants differed in personality type distributions from four comparison groups of educators.

3. There were no statistically significant differences in personality type distributions of consultants rated more effective and less effective.

4. Consultants were generally satisfied with their jobs; however, the satisfied and dissatisfied groups differed in personality type distributions when specific job characteristics were considered.

5. Statistically significant positive associations were established between more effective consultants and their feelings of job satisfaction in 4 of 21 tests.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Problem

This study was concerned with the identification of personality characteristics of regional vocational education program consultants through the application of the psychological type theory of C. G. Jung, and the determination of whether the characteristics of more effective consultants differed from those of less effective consultants. Additional information was sought concerning the consultants' feelings of job satisfaction and their association with personality and role effectiveness.

In recent years educators have been asked to solve an ever-increasing number of society's problems. National attention was focused upon the concepts of career education which attempted to offer direction and purpose to individuals by educating them for personal fulfillment as well as societal benefit. The special emphasis placed upon vocational education as part of those efforts resulted in major federal and state legislation. As a consequence, in Florida, the Vocational Division established five geographically distributed regional offices to place vocational program consultants close to the clients they served.

The general role of the regional consultants was the provision of consultative services and technical assistance. Administrators and teachers were served by consultants in their vocational program service areas which included agribusiness and natural resources, business, home economics, health and public service, industrial, marketing and distributive, and industrial arts education. As highly qualified specialists, the consultants exerted a considerable influence upon the content, comprehensiveness, and quality of the 6,000-7,000 occupational education programs offered in 67 school districts and 28 community colleges in Florida.

Of growing concern to the Vocational Division was a relatively high turnover rate in the regional consultant positions, resulting in the loss of what were thought to be some of the most effective consultants. When vacancies were filled, despite a systematic recruitment process of selection, the placement of a competent, effective, satisfied consultant was not always accomplished. Expressed reasons for departures were diverse: organizational displacement, lack of promotional opportunity, the changing role of consultants, early retirement opportunities, and lack of financial reward. All of these reasons were in various ways related to job satisfaction.

According to Williams (Note 1), "Job satisfaction has become one of the most researched facets of work" (p. 11), and persistent controversy has existed about the roots of

job satisfaction and the definition and measurement of the concept. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) theorized that job satisfaction stemmed from content factors termed motivators while dissatisfactions arose from context factors named hygienes. Another aspect of the motivation-hygiene theory was that the feelings an individual had toward the content factors reflected that person's search for psychological growth.

Differences in the psychological effects of job content were thought to be important, not only for their underlying effects upon feelings of job satisfaction, but also for their possible influence upon the role effectiveness of consultants. Jung (1921/1971) developed a psychological theory of types which indicated an orderly and consistent variation in behavior based upon the ways people prefer to use their perception and judgment. The writer speculated that the identification of personalities developed from type theory could provide answers to questions of role effectiveness and job satisfaction.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was the identification of personality characteristics of regional program consultants, and whether the characteristics of effective consultants differed from those of less effective consultants. Additional information was sought concerning job satisfaction and its possible association with the consultants'

personality characteristics and role effectiveness. More specifically, the study was designed to discover the following:

1. The personality types of regional program consultants as indicated by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) on four scales:
   a. Introversion-Extraversion—An attitude scale
   b. Sensing-Intuition—How information is acquired
   c. Thinking-Feeling—How decisions are made
   d. Judgment-Perception—How the outer world is dealt with.
2. Whether the personality characteristics of regional consultants were different from those of other educators based upon the distribution of psychological types as determined by the MBTI.
3. Whether the personality types as determined by the MBTI of effective consultants differed from the personality types of less effective consultants.
4. Whether the consultants' feelings of job satisfaction as determined by a self-developed survey instrument were associated with personality types of consultants as determined by the MBTI.
5. Whether there was an association of the role effectiveness of consultants with their feelings of job satisfaction.

Delimitations and Limitations

In seeking answers to the previous questions, the following constraints were observed:

1. The study included all of the regional program consultants in the five offices of the Vocational Division in Florida.
2. Additional data were sought from 12 recently departed former regional consultants. Some of these consultants had departed very recently; however, it was not expedient to collect data from consultants who had departed earlier than approximately two years prior to the conduct of the study.
3. Separate instruments were used to collect the data. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was utilized to identify personality characteristics, while a self-developed instrument which addressed feelings of satisfaction for job characteristics specific to the consultant's role was used as a measure of job satisfaction.

The following limitations of the study were recognized:

1. The study was conducted with the participation of regional program consultants and ex-consultants from the five regional offices of the Vocational Division in Florida. Generalization of results beyond that population was not possible.

2. The data collected in the study by responses to self-report survey questionnaires were subject to the perception of the respondents.
3. The ratings of the participants into more effective and less effective groups involved judgments made by the five regional program administrators.

Justification for the Study

The Florida Legislature, since the late 1960s, has shown substantial concern for a comprehensive vocational education program by enacting legislation to provide a balanced curriculum in the state school system and financial resources for facility construction and program expansion. Trapnell (1977) theorized that passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 reinforced those efforts by increased emphasis on planning, research, advisory councils, and program evaluation. Legislative edict and a major reorganization in the Florida Department of Education brought about changing roles for regional vocational education program consultants who were located in the five regional offices of the Vocational Division. Trapnell attempted to analyze these roles and their perceptions by major clients in school districts and community colleges who were the recipients of consultative services, and suggested that "the improvement of instruction and the continued growth and development of quality vocational education programs in the state of Florida is largely dependent upon the types of

technical services provided by the regional program consultants to [the local education agencies through their] directors, deans, and supervisors" (p. 10).

Because of the personalized nature of technical assistance and consultative services, continuity in the consultant's position was highly desirable. Much effort and energy were expended by consultants in the establishment and maintenance of viable working relationships with clients. When a vacancy occurred in the ranks of the consultants, bureaucratic inertia created a time lapse before that position could be filled. Once the position was filled, even by the most competent person, an additional time lapse occurred before truly effective services to local education agencies could be restored. A source of concern to the Vocational Division was the departure of a sizable number of consultants, and of equal concern, the difficulties of locating and employing adequate replacements.

There was a need to know more about the kinds of individuals who operated effectively in the role of regional consultant. For example, one could have predicted that an extraverted personality would enjoy the personal contacts and serve effectively as a consultant, but this would in no way have precluded an introverted personality from being the ultimate in effectiveness. On the other hand, the introverted personality might have detested the personalized aspects of the position which could have resulted in a great

deal of job dissatisfaction. Other aspects of personality also needed to be examined, such as how information was acquired, how decisions were made, as well as how persons dealt with the outside world. All of these traits could be related to job effectiveness or job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been widely researched; yet in the case of the regional consultants who had a relatively high turnover in their positions, it was deemed important to know what aspects of their jobs produced satisfactions or dissatisfactions. And further, did those feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction relate to effective accomplishment in the performance of the consultant's role?

The results of the study should be of value in the establishment of personnel and operating policies. The knowledge of personality traits which associate with effective job execution in the consultant's role and elements of job satisfaction would be a valuable tool in the selection and retention of the most effective regional consultants. Because of the special group considered in the study, the application of its design would be limited. The study could also be readily modified to serve as a functional model for the study of other unique groups in the educational community.

Definition of Terms

Regional vocational program consultant: An individual employed by the Department of Education who is

assigned to one of the five regional offices within the Division of Vocational Education for the primary purpose of providing consultative services and technical assistance in one of the vocational program service areas to local education agencies within the geographical region.

Vocational program service area: Organized programs of instruction offered at the middle school, junior high school, high school, postsecondary, and adult levels in one of seven instructional subject areas including agribusiness and natural resources, home economics, business, health and public service, industrial, marketing and distributive, and industrial arts education.

Local education agency: A specific school district or community college, usually referred to as an LEA.

Consultant role: The set of behaviors expected of an incumbent in the position of regional vocational program consultant.

Regional program administrator: An individual employed by the Department of Education who is assigned to administer the activities of one of the five regional offices of the Division of Vocational Education.

Personality: In this study personality refers to a person's self-reported preferences for perception and judgment and the attitudes a person exhibits in expressing these preferences.

Personality types: Preferences expressed by an index or combinations of indices from the four scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Type is usually expressed as a four-letter composite (e.g., ESTJ).

Type table: A conventional presentation of the 16 possible combinations of indices composing the personality types derived from responses to the MBTI.

Procedures

Study Design

The study was a descriptive survey in which manipulation of the variables was not possible. The major purpose of the study was to examine the personality characteristics of regional vocational education program consultants as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and relate them to overall effectiveness and job satisfaction when functioning in the consultant role. The question of whether the consultants differed from comparable groups of educators obtained from earlier research was also investigated. Classification of overall effectiveness was accomplished by the regional program administrators who immediately supervised and regularly evaluated the performance of the regional consultants. Satisfaction with job characteristics was measured by a self-developed Job Satisfaction Questionnaire which was administered with the MBTI in a single sitting in each of the regional offices of

the Vocational Division. The data were analyzed through appropriate statistical procedures.

Sample

The sample of incumbent regional vocational education program consultants consisted of 34 members (one position was vacant) located in the five regional offices of the Vocational Division in Florida. An additional 12 recently departed former consultants were identified for inclusion in the administration of the survey instruments. These consultants had departed the position within the two years prior to the study.

Identifying the More Effective and Less Effective Consultants

In determining the sample populations of more effective and less effective consultants, the regional program administrators were asked to look beyond the characteristics upon which annual evaluations were based and to consider the overall effectiveness of each individual. They were presented with a list of consultants who were under their direct supervision and for whom they were responsible in determining an annual performance evaluation, and were asked to consider all aspects of their job performance as well as the 12 elements which entered into annual evaluations. The list was to be divided into equal numbers of consultants considered more effective and less effective. In the case of an odd-numbered list, one name could either be omitted or placed with the most conforming group.

The briefing of administrators was oral by the researcher, and the desired procedures and responses were included in writing with each list. Ratings were recorded in columns designated more effective and less effective, and the results were sealed in an envelope. Complete confidentiality was assured in the handling of the data.

No subjects were discarded, which resulted in sample populations of 24 consultants rated more effective and 21 rated less effective.

Instrumentation

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G was the instrument selected for the determination of personality traits. The MBTI is a forced-choice self-report developed by Isabel Briggs Myers and Katherine C. Briggs (Myers, 1962), based upon Jung's theory of psychological types. Four interacting preferences are used to establish each of 16 types:

Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I)—An interest directed toward the outer world of actions, objects, and persons (E), or to the inner world of concepts and ideas (I).

Sensing (S) or Intuition (N)—A tendency to perceive the immediate, real, practical facts of life (S), or to examine possibilities, relationships, and meanings or experiences (N).

Thinking (T) or Feeling (F)—A preference for making decisions objectively and impersonally, while considering

reasonable consequences (T), or a preference for making decisions subjectively and weighing the values of choices and how they affect others (F).

Judging (J) or Perception (P)—A preference for living a life that is organized, systematic, and planned (J), or a life that is spontaneous, flexible, and adaptive (P).

The preferred style of operation in each of these four dimensions establishes the 16 possible combinations of personality types. Information from the Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1975) explains that the Form G was developed with the partial intent of rechecking the validity of each scored item and making available to researchers a form shorter than the original Form F.

The revised form contains 126 items obtained by the elimination of 40 items from Form F. Normative studies were repeated for the new form to ensure that cultural changes had not eroded the validity of the self-report instrument. Item analyses were used to establish extreme scores for each scale. No changes in scoring weights were required for the EI, SN, or JP scales; however, an adjustment of the TF scale was necessary to conform to the distribution of unselected males and females.

Emphasis was made that minor changes in items and the revision of scoring weights had not adversely affected the high correlations maintained between Form G and Form F scores. Because of these studies and the established use

of the MBTI in research for over 20 years (including the use of Form G over the past 5 years) no additional tests of reliability were considered for use of the instrument in this study.

A second instrument was a self-developed job satisfaction questionnaire (see Appendix C) which uses a 5-increment Likert scale to evaluate 40 job characteristics in terms of feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These characteristics include the five areas used by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) in the development of their Job Descriptive Index—work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers. The characteristics concerned with work are specific to the regional consultant role and were derived in part from the consultant's Program of Work (Note 2), a document which annually projects the individual consultant's anticipated activities. A single all-inclusive question on job satisfaction was included as a confirmation factor, and space was provided to add and evaluate other job characteristics as an indication of the comprehensiveness of the list of characteristics. Several revisions were required before a final format was obtained and the finished instrument was reviewed by regional program administrators to establish content validity. No measures of construct validity were accomplished.

The third instrument, which was used to differentiate the overall role effectiveness of the regional consultants,

consisted of five lists of consultants who had been under the direct supervision of each of the five regional program administrators. Each list was to be equally divided into two groups—those considered more effective and those considered less effective in the overall performance of the role of regional program consultant.

Data Collection

The collection of data was accomplished in two phases. The first phase consisted of preliminary communications and the selection or development of data-gathering instruments. Prior approval was necessary to utilize personnel of the Vocational Division for study as well as acquiescence of the subjects. Approvals to conduct the study were sought and obtained through personal visits by the researcher to the division director, the bureau chief, and the section director. A single meeting with the five regional program administrators, combined with follow-up telephone communications, established willingness of regional incumbents to participate in the study. A return-mail card was sent with a letter to each of 12 recently departed former regional consultants to determine their willingness to participate in the study. A positive response was received from all those contacted. Data-gathering instruments were selected and/or developed during this period as described in the previous section.

The second phase of data collection consisted of the administration of the survey instruments. Each of the five regional offices was visited by the researcher over a period of eight days, and the survey instruments were executed by the regional consultants during a regular staff meeting. As a means of avoiding possible biases toward questions which might be discussed in the regular staff meeting, the writer requested that this be the first item on the agenda—a procedure that was generally followed. Each regional consultant was briefed and asked to respond to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and, upon completion, to respond to the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. In a separate meeting the regional program administrators were asked to complete the classification of more effective and less effective consultants from a list of individuals who had performed under their supervision. The list was to be divided into two equal-numbered groups; however, in considering odd-numbered lists, administrators were permitted the option of omitting one individual or of placing the odd-numbered person with the most conforming group. During this same time period, the recently departed former consultants were mailed the survey instruments with instructions for completion and return. Each participant was assured of the complete confidentiality of the study. No respondent was to be identified by name or discipline in the treatment of the data. All documents were immediately sealed in an

envelope upon completion and remained in the custody of the researcher.

Data Treatment

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator answer sheets were computer scored by the Center for Applications of Psychological Type (CAPT) for a determination of personality types of the regional consultants. Type tables were prepared to display the distributions of personality types in the total sample population and in the subpopulations of incumbents and recently departed consultants. These tables included frequencies and percentages of individual types as well as the indices of the four scales which combine to make up the MBTI.

The first comparisons between the total sample population of consultants and the two subpopulations were made to determine homogeneity by use of the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT), a computer program developed by CAPT for comparison of the sample populations in MBTI research. The SRTT program uses Chi-square statistics and Fisher's Exact Probability Test to report four facts in each comparison made within the MBTI type table format. The number, percent in the table, selection ratio, and the probability that the ratio occurred by chance are recorded for each personality type and each of the group indices. The selection ratio represents the expected frequency of an

occurrence in the table based upon the observed frequency of a comparison sample.

Samples of other educators were sought from earlier research and from the data bank maintained in the Center for Applications of Psychological Type (CAPT) in order to compare the composition of the consultants' sample population with that of other educator groups. Four groups were identified for comparison—samples of high school teachers; adult education teachers; trade, industrial, and technical teachers from the CAPT data bank; and a sample of secondary supervisory teachers from a research study (Hoffman, 1974).

Two comparisons of the consultants' sample population and the four selected samples were made. First, because of the small numbers of personality types in several of the samples, the four cells in each quadrant of the 16-cell MBTI type table were collapsed to form a total of four groups characterized by two dimensions. These four groups were identified by the common characteristics of each as IS, IN, ES, and EN. The minimum requirements for Chi square were met by this manipulation, and comparisons were made between each of the selected groups and the total sample population of consultants. The second comparison of the consultants with other educators examined the expected frequency of MBTI personality types of the consultants in each of the 16 cells of the type table by use of the SRTT

program. In all instances statistical significance at the 95% confidence level was sought.

Tables indicating the distribution of personality types of the more effective and less effective regional consultants were prepared for the total sample population and its subpopulations. The SRTT program was utilized for determination of the expected personality distributions and their statistically significant differences from sample populations.

The Job Satisfaction Questionnaires were scored by the researcher and the results tabluated by classifications of the more satisfied and less satisfied groups for the total sample population and its two subpopulations. The sources of job satisfaction were rank ordered and the 10 principal sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction displayed. The SRTT program was applied to the total sample population for an examination of the expected frequencies of personality types who expressed satisfaction or dissatisfaction derived from each of the 40 job characteristics. The results with the 10 principal sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were displayed and analyzed.

Contingency tables showing frequency distributions of scores of the more effective and less effective consultants on the 20 selected job characteristics of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire were prepared and examined for association. Point biserial correlation coefficients were

computed for the 20 selected tables. Investigation of the distribution of personality types was pursued by the application of the SRTT program to a two-by-two comparison of role effectiveness and job satisfaction organized by MBTI types.

Organization of the Research Study

Chapter I introduced the problem investigated by the study with its limitations and justification. The chapter also includes the procedures that were followed from the design of the study through the treatment of the data.

A review of related literature and previous research is presented in Chapter II.

In Chapter III the data are displayed, analyzed, and discussed.

Chapter IV presents the findings, conclusions, and implications of the study.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature related to this study was limited to the following subjects: psychological types and personality characteristics; role effectiveness, primarily among educators; and theories and studies of job satisfaction. Some of these topics have been the subject of extensive research and, when this was the case, only a limited number of the studies were mentioned in the review.

Psychological Types

Carl Jung and Alfred Adler departed from the teachings of Freud in their pursuit of an understanding of the human psyche and went along separate paths. Jung (1964) explained that in his practice of psychoanalysis he early recognized the necessity for giving some order to the limitless variations in human individuality. He had previously differentiated attitude, which he identified as either extraversion or introversion, terms which he coined. He felt, however, that these were just two among many peculiarities of human behavior and proceeded to identify what he called irrational (i.e., perceiving) and rational (i.e., ordering) functions.

Jung (1921/1971) felt the need to define the ways in which his outlook differed from Freud's and Adler's and his

book Psychological Types was the result. In this volume Jung discussed his understanding of psychic functions and presented a theory of psychological types. He theorized that greater understanding would be possible if one could comprehend the attitude and the preferred primary and auxiliary psychic functions of an individual. The value of type theory for Jung was that it provided a system of comparisons and orientation which made possible a critical psychology. He established two general attitude types, extraversion and introversion, and four function types, sensation, intuition, thinking, and feeling. Each of the four function types varied according to the general attitude type, which produced eight variants. These eight variants are referred to as the eight basic Jungian personality types.

The development of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) made available an instrument which enables individuals to indicate their preferred mode of operation (Myers, 1962). The instrument is described in the instrumentation section of Chapter I. A feature of the development of the MBTI was the addition to Jung's typology of a judging-perception preference which assists in the identification of an individual's dominant and auxiliary processes of perception and judgment. This added dimension created a total of 16 possible variants in defining psychological types and resulted in the four-letter designation used by the MBTI to identify type.

Practical applications of the MBTI have resulted in studies of psychological types in a wide variety of settings. In one of the first reported experiments, Laney (1949) explored the relationship of personality with occupational choice and job turnover in an industrial setting. He concluded that introverts appeared to prefer sedentary work and extraverts appeared to prefer physically active work. An additional finding was a difference in personality types of those who resigned their jobs to return to school. There were higher proportions of introverts, intuitives, thinking, and perceptive types in the group which returned to school.

Von Fange (1961) investigated a sample of 1,084 students, teachers, and administrators and reported that administrators tend to be extraverted judging types, with 55% of the principals and 45% of the superintendents sampled being EJ types. In this respect they did not appear to differ from male teachers, but did differ in personality type from the general population. The broad range of types found in the general population was not found among the administrators sampled, where a preponderance of ESTJ personality types occurred.

Hoffman and Betkouski (1981) reported the most common personality type among teachers as extraverted, sensing, feeling, and judging, and cited the research of Hoffman (1974), Lawrence (1974), Wright (1966), and others in support of this observation. They also found from the research

that female teachers were predominantly feeling types, and the male teachers were predominantly thinking types. In this respect males showed a slight departure from the majority type.

In one of the more comprehensive reviews of research on teacher's personality and characteristics, Getzels and Jackson (1963) examined studies using various personality theories such as trait theory, need theory, and psychoanalytic theory. After a critical review of research using the most recognized instruments for personality measurements, they concluded that

> despite the critical importance of the problem and a half-century of prodigious research effort, very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher personality, or about the relation between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness. (in Gage, 1963, p. 574)

Michaelis (in Gage, 1963) concluded a study on predictions of teaching efficiency with a plea for a theoretical approach to the study of teacher personality. He recognized as a hindrance in personality theory a lack of basic information concerning characteristics and personal traits of persons selecting the profession of teaching.

In recent years the development and expanding use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator have provided an appropriate device for the examination of personality and the furtherance of Jung's "critical psychology" (p. 22).

Role Effectiveness

Much of the literature and research concerned with effectiveness of educators has been directed toward teacher effectiveness in the classroom or the study of teachers' personality traits and teacher-learner relationships. When administrators were subjects of research, many of the studies focused upon management and leadership styles. Since the subjects of this study functioned in an administrative role, yet almost without exception had a background of classroom teaching, both areas were reviewed.

Ryans (1960) conducted a landmark study of teacher behavior in the classroom and developed observation techniques for the establishment of inventories of estimated teacher characteristics. The Teacher Characteristics Study (TCS) utilized 450 school systems, 1,700 schools, and observed 6,000 teachers. The results of such an extensive study cannot be summarized here; however, the teacher-observation phase of the investigation identified three major patterns of teacher classroom behavior:

> TCS pattern X understanding, friendly versus aloof, egocentric, restricted teacher behavior
>
> TCS pattern Y responsible, businesslike, systematic versus evading, unplanned, slipshod teacher behavior
>
> TCS pattern Z stimulating, imaginative, surgent or enthusiastic versus dull, routine teacher behavior. (Ryans, 1960, p. 79)

These patterns were the qualities of teacher behavior used for comparisons between observed groups and survey samples of teachers from the United States as a whole. Both groups were also administered self-report inventories which provided seven additional characteristics involving attitudes, understanding, and response. The resulting omnibus self-report inventory was used for numerous comparisons involving experience, age, sex, emotional stability, and pupil behavior. Some of the differences between "highly" assessed and "lowly" assessed teachers are of interest.

The "good" teacher group liked personal contacts, were generous in their appraisals of others, showed interest in the arts and cultural affairs, read a great deal, and scored higher on verbal intelligence and emotional stability. The majority were also married, between the ages of 35 and 49, and had a better than average college academic record.

The characteristics of the "lowly" assessed group were almost the opposite of the "highly" assessed group of teachers in many respects, and suggested that the ineffective teacher is self-centered, anxious, and restricted. The majority of this group was also in the late middle and older age classifications.

Ryans' research did not resolve the question of who is a good teacher, but offered findings which could assist in that determination through observable classroom behavior.

In addressing the need for measures of teacher competence, Biddle and Ellena (1964) wrote about the proliferation of research which has occurred in pursuit of teacher effectiveness and the apparent lack of facts resulting from those efforts. Biddle and Ellena felt that most of the studies up to 1964 had produced negligible results primarily because of two factors—confusion and the complexity of the problem. They maintained that "the problem of teacher effectiveness is so complex that no one today knows what The Competent Teacher is" (p. 2).

Hamachek (1969) responded to the above quotation in his review of research on teacher effectiveness and identified the personal characteristics of good or effective teachers. He concluded that effective teachers are those who are most "human." They have a sense of humor, are fair, relate easily to students, are empathetic, and are more democratic than autocratic. They also are more open, spontaneous, and adaptable to change. Ineffective teachers, on the other hand, were characterized as less well-integrated, somewhat authoritarian, lacking in a sense of humor, impatient, and less sensitive to the needs of their students.

Hoffman (1974) examined the relationship between 106 supervising teachers and student teachers who evaluated their effectiveness. This was one of several studies concerned with matching personality traits in which it was

found that, even though supervising and student teachers differed as a group, there was no significant difference in the way the overall relationships between them were reported. Characteristics which contributed to highly rated relationships between cooperating teachers were found to include being professional, a good model, concerned, perceptive, unselfish, and encouraging.

Hurst (1976) studied the effects of similarity of psychological types upon mutual evaluations of effectiveness by teachers and students in the health professions. The MBTI was used as an identification of personality; however, the effect of personality similarity or dissimilarity did not appear as a major factor in the evaluations of students and teachers.

In a recent study, Morrison (1980) addressed the question of personality types among administrators and found principals to be predominatly sensing and judging as a group. Findings of Von Fange (1961) agreed with these data by identifying the ESTJ personality type as the most common type among principals in his study, with 92% found to be judging types. He found the ESTJ personality to be an effective administrator—one who might be identified as follows:

> He is practical, realistic, matter-of-fact and concerned with the present state of affairs. Problems are analyzed with impersonal logic; he is unlikely to be convinced by anything but reasoning. This type of principal enjoys being an executive, deciding

> what ought to be done, and giving the necessary orders. However, employees beware, as he has little patience with inefficiency and knows how to be tough when the situation calls for it. (Hoffman & Betkouski, 1981, p. 13)

In summary, the subject of teacher effectiveness has dominated the research concerning educators in this field and the works have been voluminous. Most of the findings have been inconclusive in establishing what constitutes a truly effective educator. Few of the empirical studies have involved the use of Jungian theory, and, while the need for a formal theoretical position is recognized, the very complexity of the problem mitigates against the establishment of widely accepted theories in the educational community.

Job Satisfaction

The subject of job satisfaction has been widely researched, and many of the studies and measurements of job satisfaction are based upon basic theories of individual needs. Some of the expectancy and gratification theories are briefly identified, and the development and use of job satisfaction measurements reviewed.

Murray (1938) was one of the first individuals to attempt systematically to improve the prediction of performance from test data, taking motivations into account as well as pathological processes which might impede their progress. He theorized that psychogenic needs categorized social motives of man, and established a needs theory based upon

characteristics such as achievement, nurturance, dominance, and order.

Maslow's (1954) well-recognized theory of hierarchical needs was based upon five levels of human needs, beginning with physiological requirements for survival and progressing to an ultimate goal of self-actualization. He theorized that the lack of satisfaction of a lower-order need can provide strong motivation; however, once satisfied, a need no longer act as a motivator. Higher-order needs on the other hand are never fully realized and thus are continuously sought once the lower-order needs have been satisfied.

Kimbrough and Nunnery (1976) recognized the influence of Maslow in the works of McGregor (1960), who advanced his Theory X and Theory Y. In Theory Y, McGregor speculated that a satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior, but that a commitment to objectives is related to the rewards associated with their achievement. Other aspects of Theory Y were that work is natural to man and he will exercise self-direction and self-control towards objectives to which he is committed; that the average person not only accepts, but will seek responsibility under proper conditions; and that in a modern setting, intellectual potentialities of the average human are not fully utilized even though the capacity for solving organization problems through imagination, ingenuity, and creativity is widespread. Many of the assumptions underlying the pluralistic collegial concept

of administration are apparent in the foundations of McGregor's Theory Y.

Early research in job satisfaction was less than precise in what was meant by a satisfied worker, and satisfaction was a term which researchers assumed respondents understood in terms of their jobs. Vroom (1964) formalized his expectancy theory in mathematical terms so that precise relationships could be expressed concerning four basic elements. The relative values of an individual's perception of performance outcomes were recorded as valence, expectancy, instrumentality, and force. Valence represented the strength of feeling an individual had toward an outcome of his job performance, and could be either positive or negative. Numerical values were assigned the interactive relationships of the other elements and combined in mathematical formulas to determine job satisfaction. Expectancy was a measure of the belief that certain behavior would result in a particular outcome and could vary from zero, representing no expectation of the outcome, to a value of one, representing a positive belief in the outcome. Vroom contended that the perceptive nature of his model took into account the individual differences in motives among persons.

Herzberg et al. (1959) presented the results of a study of engineers and accountants in industry and the development of what has become known as Herzberg's

Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The theory was based upon the identification of factors which served as strong determiners of job satisfaction. These satisfiers were named motivators since other findings of the study suggested that they were effective in motivating the individual to superior performance and effort. Other factors were identified as dissatisfiers and named hygienes.

Motivators, identified as achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, and advancement were associated with the conduct of the job and thus were considered as content factors. Hygienes, which were salary, supervision, working conditions, company policy, and interpersonal relations, associated more with conditions of the job and were considered context factors. Content factors as a group influenced attitudes over longer duration than context factors.

One unique aspect of Herzberg's theory was that the continua of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were separate and unipolar. The opposite of job satisfaction would not be dissatisfaction but no job satisfaction, and similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction. These parallel but opposite tracks are analogous to the avoidance of pain in the environment, represented by the context scale, whereas self-fulfillment or psychological growth through the accomplishment of tasks is represented by the content scale.

A great amount of research has been completed concerning Herzberg's concept by use of the critical incident technique. Some of the results have been inconsistent and have subjected the theory to considerable criticism. Herzberg (1966) defended concepts of the original study in his book Work and the Nature of Man by presenting the results of nine validating research studies, all of which supported his theory in varying degrees.

Studies of university and community college administrators by Groseth (1978), Kozal (1979), and Thomas (1977), using the Herzberg Theory, have supported the two-factor aspects of the theory. Motivators were found to contribute more to job satisfaction and hygienes to contribute more to dissatisfactions in each of these studies.

Smith et al. (1969) collaborated in an extensive study of job satisfaction at Cornell University and developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The JDI investigated five areas of job activity—work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers—and respondents were asked to describe their feelings about job satisfaction in terms of lists of adjectives in each of the five classifications. The instrument is thus job referent rather than worker referent, and was designed for application to a wide variety of persons on a variety of jobs in a variety of situations. The JDI, a very carefully researched and validated instrument, measures areas of job satisfaction which correspond closely to

those selected by other researchers such as Herzberg (1966) and Bochman (1971).

In the limited review of literature concerning relationships between job satisfaction and personality, no investigations which related directly to this study were found. A remarkable lack of definition in measures of personality or job satisfaction was observed. Williams (Note 1), on reaching a similar conclusion in her review of the subject, stated that "with better instruments for measuring job satisfaction and for identifying personality types, perhaps a relationship CAN be demonstrated" (p. 36).

Chapter Summary

A limited review of the literature related to the study was presented in this chapter. Included was a discussion of Jungian type theory and the application of the Myers-Briggs instrument in a number of studies of personality types. A sample of the voluminous literature concerned with role effectiveness was also reviewed. The final section of the review was concerned with basic theories of job satisfaction and some of their applications.

CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

Descriptions and charted presentations of the data gathered in the study are recorded in this chapter and in the Appendices. The data are organized in five subject areas related to the questions posed in Chapter I: (1) the personality type data gathered from responses to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), (2) the MBTI distribution comparisons, (3) the consultants' role effectiveness data and their associations with MBTI personality types, (4) the consultants' job satisfaction data and their associations with the MBTI personality types, and (5) the data which are relevant to the associations of the consultants' role effectiveness and their feelings of job satisfaction.

A special effort was made through follow-up to obtain as complete a response as possible from the sample population because of the relatively small size of the population under examination. Responses were obtained from all 34 of the incumbent regional consultants in the five field offices of the Vocational Division of the state of Florida and from 11 of the 12 recently departed regional consultants from whom survey information was sought. For purposes of comparison, the sample population was divided into two

subpopulations consisting of incumbent consultants and recently departed consultants. The two subpopulations were established to observe possible influences stemming from differences between the perceptions of incumbent consultants and those of recently departed consultants, and as an aid in deciding whether the sample population should be treated as a homogeneous group.

Myers-Briggs Psychological Types

The distributions of personality types of the regional consultants were determined from responses to Form G of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI uses a four-letter combination to identify psychological types in which each letter represents the preferred pole of the four dichotomous scales which constitute the MBTI—an ISTJ, for example, would represent an individual with an expressed preference for introversion (I), sensing (S), thinking (T), and judging (J). The Myers-Briggs type table is conventionally used to display the distributions of the 16 possible letter combinations derived from responses to the MBTI. The type table is a 16-cell matrix which locates personality types in a logical order and, because of its widespread use, provides an understandable vehicle for interpreting research which includes MBTI data.

Table 1 displays the type table for the total sample population of consultants; Tables 2 and 3 display the type tables for the two subpopulations. Frequencies and

Table 1

Personality Types of All Consultants

N = 45

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 13.3	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 8.9	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.2	*INTJ* N = 3 % = 6.7	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.2	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.4	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.2	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 6.7	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.4	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.2	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 8 % = 17.8	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 6.7	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.4	*ENTJ* N = 8 % = 17.8	JUDGING

	N	%
E	27	60.0
I	18	40.0
S	27	60.0
N	18	40.0
T	30	66.7
F	15	33.3
J	35	77.8
P	10	22.2
IJ	14	31.1
IP	4	8.9
EP	6	13.3
EJ	21	46.7
ST	18	40.0
SF	9	20.0
NF	6	13.3
NT	12	26.7
SJ	21	46.7
SP	6	13.3
NP	4	8.9
NJ	14	31.1
TJ	25	55.6
TP	5	11.1
FP	5	11.1
FJ	10	22.2
IN	5	11.1
EN	13	28.9
IS	13	28.9
ES	14	31.1

NOTES:

Table 2

Personality Types of Incumbent Consultants

N=34

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N= 5 %= 14.7	*ISFJ* N= 3 %= 8.8	*INFJ* N= 1 %= 2.9	*INTJ* N= 2 %= 5.9	JUDGING INTROVERTS
ISTP N= 0 %= 0.0	*ISFP* N= 2 %= 5.9	*INFP* N= 1 %= 2.9	*INTP* N= 0 %= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N= 3 %= 8.8	*ESFP* N= 0 %= 0.0	*ENFP* N= 0 %= 0.0	*ENTP* N= 1 %= 2.9	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N= 7 %= 20.6	*ESFJ* N= 3 %= 8.8	*ENFJ* N= 2 %= 5.9	*ENTJ* N= 4 %= 11.8	JUDGING

	N	%
E	20	58.8
I	14	41.2
S	23	67.6
N	11	32.4
T	22	64.7
F	12	35.3
J	27	79.4
P	7	20.6
IJ	11	32.4
IP	3	8.8
EP	4	11.8
EJ	16	47.0
ST	15	44.1
SF	8	23.5
NF	4	11.8
NT	7	20.6
SJ	18	52.9
SP	5	14.7
NP	2	5.9
NJ	9	26.5
TJ	18	52.9
TP	4	11.8
FP	3	8.8
FJ	9	26.5
IN	4	11.8
EN	7	20.6
IS	10	29.4
ES	13	38.2

NOTES:

Table 3

Personality Types of Recently Departed Consultants

N=11

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N= 1 %= 9.1	*ISFJ* N= 1 %= 9.1	*INFJ* N= 0 %= 0.0	*INTJ* N= 1 %= 9.1	JUDGING
ISTP N= 1 %= 9.1	*ISFP* N= 0 %= 0.0	*INFP* N= 0 %= 0.0	*INTP* N= 0 %= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N= 0 %= 0.0	*ESFP* N= 0 %= 0.0	*ENFP* N= 2 %= 18.2	*ENTP* N= 0 %= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N= 1 %= 9.0	*ESFJ* N= 0 %= 0.0	*ENFJ* N= 0 %= 0.0	*ENTJ* N= 4 %= 36.4	JUDGING

	N	%
E	7	63.6
I	4	36.4
S	4	36.4
N	7	63.6
T	8	72.7
F	3	27.3
J	8	72.7
P	3	27.3
IJ	3	27.3
IP	1	9.1
EP	2	18.2
EJ	5	45.4
ST	3	27.3
SF	1	9.1
NF	2	18.2
NT	5	45.4
SJ	3	27.3
SP	1	9.1
NP	2	18.2
NJ	5	45.4
TJ	7	63.6
TP	1	9.1
FP	2	18.2
FJ	1	9.1
IN	1	9.1
EN	6	54.5
IS	3	27.3
ES	1	9.1

NOTES:

percentages of individual types are indicated in each of the 16 cells of the type tables. Frequencies and percentages of the indices of the four scales which identify personality types and combinations of indices are displayed in right-hand columns. In Table 1, for example, six consultants are identified as ISTJ personality types and this number constitutes 13.3% of the total sample population. Likewise, 27 consultants (60%) are listed with an extraversion (E) preference while 18, or 40%, of the consultants are shown with the introversion (I) preference. A choice for the introversion-judging (IJ) combination was expressed by 14 subjects (31.1%).

A review of the data in Table 1 showed that ESFP and INTP personality types were not represented in the type table, while frequencies of the remaining 14 types ranged from 1 to 8. Inspection of the consultants' responses on the four basic scales of the MBTI revealed them, as a group, to be predominantly judging (J=77.8%) and very thinking (T=66.7%); however, they fell within the norms established by Myers (1962) for samples of individuals with comparable levels of education and responsibility. The least conformity occurred on the thinking-feeling (TF) scale where the consultants sample contained a higher percentage (66.7%) of thinking (T) responses than any other sample of the comparable groups except the male, industry-hired college graduates (82%). A recent review of MBTI research applications in education by Hoffman and Betkouski (1981) included

the very consistent results of six studies with a total of 1,389 teacher subjects. A reported majority in each study sample showed preferences for extraversion (51% to 57%), sensing (53% to 74%), feeling (55% to 66%), and judging (63% to 82%). The consultants sample conformed closely to the E, S, and J preferences in the studies but reversed the preference of the most common type of teacher, ESFJ, on the thinking-feeling (TF) scale. Myers (1962) and Lawrence (1979) described ESFJ types as dependable, thorough, conscientious, systematic, hard working, and expecting others to be the same. They are also tactful, sympathetic, and value harmony in their relationships, characteristics brought about by their preferences for feeling (F).

The consultants differed in the TF dimension from the most frequently encountered teachers in the review by Hoffman and Betkouski (1981) by expressing a greater number of preferences for thinking (T), choices which contributed traits identified by Myers (1962) as logical, executive, critical, decisive, and efficiency demanding.

Myers-Briggs Personality Type Comparisons

Comparison of the Two Subpopulations of Consultants

The type tables for the two subpopulations (Tables 2 and 3) were subjected to comparisons with the total sample population by use of the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT) computer program to determine whether the incumbent

consultant group and the recently departed consultant group were homogeneous with the total sample population. The Selection Ratio Type Tables are included in Appendix A. No statistically significant differences (at the .05 level) were found in the distributions of personality types in the basic scale indices or in any combination of indices. On the basis of these data, the total sample population distributions were used for the statistical comparisons of consultants with groups of other educators.

Comparison of Consultants with Other Teacher Groups

The four groups of teachers selected from the CAPT data bank and earlier research were subjected to Chi-square comparisons with the consultants total sample population to answer the question of whether the consultants were different from other similar groups of educators. Because several cells of the type tables contained lower frequencies than were required to meet the criteria for use of Chi-square comparisons, the data in each of the four quadrants of the table (identified as IS--, IN--, ES--, and EN--) were combined and used for the comparisons. In this way requirements for Chi-square comparisons were met at some sacrifice of specificity. This four-quadrant model has been used by Damico and Dalsheimer (1974) and Lawrence (1979) in recognizing different learning and teaching styles. The Chi-square statistical comparisons are displayed in Appendix B. These general comparisons showed no statistically significant differences

in the quadrant classifications of personality types between the regional consultants and each of the four sample groups. When the more exact comparisons of the SRTT program were applied, however, differences in the distribution of types as well as in specific indices were detected. The personality distributions of each of the comparison groups of educators are shown in Tables 4 through 7. The SRTT program results for group comparisons are contained in Appendix A.

In the comparison of the consultants' personality distributions with those of a sample of high school teachers (N=426), a population from which the consultants logically originated, the consultants exhibited a frequency of ENTJ personality types over four (4.21) times greater than was expected. This difference was statistically significant at the .001 level. Also significant at the .001 level were the higher preferences for thinking (T) on the TF scale—with a corollary low preference for feeling (F)—and the thinking-judging (TJ) combination. These statistical data confirmed the earlier observation that a high percentage of consultants preferred thinking (T), and pointed to the number of ENTJ types as providing the statistically significant preference for the TJ combination that supplied that influence. Von Fange (1961) and Wright (1966), in their investigations of school principals, found the TJ combination to be dominant in their samples, confirming that these traits are characteristic of educational administrators.

Table 4

Personality Types of High School Teachers from CAPT Data Bank

N=426

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N= 54 %= 12.7	*ISFJ* N= 50 %= 11.7	*INFJ* N=30 %=7.0	*INTJ* N= 19 %= 4.5	JUDGING
ISTP N= 7 %= 1.6	*ISFP* N= 12 %= 2.8	*INFP* N= 23 %= 5.4	*INTP* N= 13 %= 3.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N= 5 %= 1.2	*ESFP* N= 12 %= 2.8	*ENFP* N= 52 %= 12.2	*ENTP* N= 15 %= 3.5	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N= 42 %= 9.8	*ESFJ* N= 37 %= 8.7	*ENFJ* N= 37 %= 8.7	*ENTJ* N=18 %=4.2	JUDGING

	N	%
E	218	51.2
I	208	48.8
S	219	51.4
N	207	48.6
T	173	40.6
F	253	59.4
J	287	67.4
P	139	32.6
IJ	153	35.6
IP	55	12.9
EP	84	19.7
EJ	134	31.5
ST	108	25.4
SF	111	26.1
NF	142	33.3
NT	65	15.2
SJ	183	43.0
SP	36	8.4
NP	103	24.2
NJ	104	24.4
TJ	133	31.2
TP	40	9.4
FP	99	23.2
FJ	154	36.2
IN	85	20.0
EN	122	28.6
IS	123	28.9
ES	96	22.5

NOTES:

Table 5

Personality Types of Secondary Supervisory Teachers from Hoffman

N=84

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N=14 %=16.7	N= 8 %= 9.5	N= 4 %= 4.8	N= 4 %= 4.8	
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
N=0 %=0.0	N= 2 %= 2.4	N= 2 %= 2.4	N= 2 %= 2.4	
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
N= 1 %= 1.2	N= 1 %= 1.2	N= 4 %= 4.8	N= 6 %= 7.1	
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	JUDGING
N= 14 %= 16.7	N=12 %=14.3	N= 7 %= 8.3	N= 3 %= 3.6	

	N	%
E	48	57.1
I	36	42.9
S	52	61.9
N	32	38.1
T	44	52.4
F	40	47.6
J	66	78.6
P	18	21.4
IJ	30	35.7
IP	6	7.1
EP	12	14.3
EJ	36	42.9
ST	29	34.5
SF	23	27.4
NF	17	20.2
NT	15	17.9
SJ	48	57.1
SP	4	4.8
NP	14	16.7
NJ	18	21.4
TJ	35	41.7
TP	9	10.7
FP	9	10.7
FJ	31	36.9
IN	12	14.3
EN	20	23.8
IS	24	28.6
ES	28	33.3

NOTES:

Table 6

Personality Types of Adult Education Teachers
from CAPT Data Bank

N=186

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N = 18 % = 9.7	N = 22 % = 11.8	N = 5 % = 2.7	N = 3 % = 1.6	INTROVERTS
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	PERCEPTIVE
N = 9 % = 4.8	N = 8 % = 4.3	N = 13 % = 7.0	N = 4 % = 2.2	
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	PERCEPTIVE
N = 6 % = 3.2	N = 10 % = 5.4	N = 16 % = 8.6	N = 7 % = 3.8	EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	JUDGING
N = 21 % = 11.3	N = 26 % = 14.0	N = 7 % = 3.8	N = 11 % = 5.9	

	N	%
E	104	55.9
I	82	44.1
S	120	64.5
N	66	35.5
T	79	42.5
F	107	57.5
J	113	60.8
P	73	39.2
IJ	48	25.8
IP	34	18.3
EP	39	21.0
EJ	65	34.9
ST	54	29.0
SF	66	35.5
NF	41	22.0
NT	25	13.4
SJ	87	46.8
SP	33	17.7
NP	40	21.5
NJ	26	14.0
TJ	53	28.5
TP	26	14.0
FP	47	25.3
FJ	60	32.2
IN	25	13.4
EN	41	22.0
IS	57	30.6
ES	63	33.9

NOTES:

Table 7

Personality Types of Trade, Industrial, and Technical Teachers from CAPT Data Bank

N=36

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N=17 %=47.2	*ISFJ* N= 1 %= 2.8	*INFJ* N= 2 %= 5.6	*INTJ* N=0 %=0.0	JUDGING INTROVERTS
ISTP N=0 %=0.0	*ISFP* N= 1 %= 2.8	*INFP* N= 1 %= 2.8	*INTP* N= 2 %= 5.6	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N= 2 %= 5.6	*ESFP* N= 2 %= 5.6	*ENFP* N= 2 %= 5.6	*ENTP* N= 0 %=0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N= 0 %=0.0	*ESFJ* N= 1 %= 2.8	*ENFJ* N= 1 %= 2.8	*ENTJ* N= 4 %= 11.1	JUDGING

	N	%
E	12	33.3
I	24	66.7
S	24	66.7
N	12	33.3
T	25	69.4
F	11	30.6
J	26	72.2
P	10	27.8
IJ	20	55.6
IP	4	11.1
EP	6	16.7
EJ	6	16.7
ST	19	52.8
SF	5	13.9
NF	6	16.7
NT	6	16.7
SJ	19	52.8
SP	5	13.9
NP	5	13.9
NJ	7	19.4
TJ	21	58.3
TP	4	11.1
FP	6	16.7
FJ	5	13.9
IN	5	13.9
EN	7	19.4
IS	19	52.8
ES	5	13.9

NOTES:

At lesser levels, statistically significant high preferences for EJ, ST, and NT combinations, and low preferences for NF and NP combinations, were found. Each of these frequencies was consistent with the high occurrence of ENTJ types, with the exception of the ST combination. The ST preference characterizes practical, realistic, logical individuals demanding of efficiency (Myers, 1962), and an inspection of the type tables indicated that the disparity in distributions stemmed more from the low incidence of ST preferences (25.4%) in the sample of high school teachers than from a disproportionately high (40.0%) occurrence of ST choices by the consultants.

The second comparison group was selected from a research study by Hoffman (1974) and was expected to exhibit a high degree of conformity with the consultant group, since they were experienced secondary teachers who had been selected by their principals for supervisory duties. The comparisons of the consultants' personalities with those of the sample of secondary supervisory teachers (N=83), however, again revealed the greater (4.98 times) than expected frequency of ENTJ types among the consultants. Except for this difference, an occurrence statistically significant at the .01 level, examination of the SRTT comparisons of the individual indices showed no statistically significant differences. The greatest difference on the four basic scales occurred on the thinking-feeling (TF) scale. The consultants

favored thinking (T) to feeling (F) by a 2:1 ratio, while the comparison group was more evenly divided, 52%:48%. In the Hoffman study it was possible to identify the male-female ratio (38%:62%), and this fact made feasible the exploration of one other aspect of the differences exhibited by the consultants. McCaulley (Note 3) reported that the best estimate of a preference for feeling (F) by females over a large number of population samples was 2:1 to 3:1. That the consultant sample was predominantly male (64%) and the comparison sample predominantly female (62%) posed the question of whether the male-female difference was responsible for the dominance for thinking (T) among the consultants over the comparison group. The question was answered in the negative when the TF scale preferences were examined by sex. Among females, the consultants showed a 62% preference for thinking (T), whereas the comparison group showed an even division between thinking (T) and feeling (F) (50%:50%) on the scale. Among males, a slightly higher preference (69%) for thinking (T) by consultants occurred compared to a 56% preference by the secondary supervisory teachers. The differences in the observed preferences for thinking (T) by the consultants were almost equally apparent for males and females (13%:12%) in this comparison, and the group preferences could not reasonably be attributed to the variations in male-female distributions within the samples. The female preferences on the TF scale of both groups were

atypical to those reported by Hoffman (1974) and McCaulley (1977).

When personality comparisons of consultants were extended to a sample of adult education teachers (N=186), the resulting data closely paralleled that from the comparisons with a sample of high school teachers. Once again, the consultants sample produced about three (3.01) times as many ENTJ personality types as were predicted from the adult educators' distribution. Statistically significantly higher preferences among the consultants for thinking (T) and judging (J) were recorded on the basic scales, with corresponding lower preferences for feeling (F) and perception (P). The consultants also exhibited statistically significantly high preferences for the combinations intuitive-thinking (NT), intuitive-judging (NJ), and thinking-judging (TJ) and low preferences for the combinations sensing-feeling (SF) and feeling-perceptive (FP). The suggestions that the consultants displayed more characteristics typical of logical, impersonal, ingenious, executive types, and fewer characteristics associated with practical, sympathetic, and adaptable types (Myers, 1962), were consistent with the statistically significantly higher occurrence of ENTJ personality types among the consultants.

The final comparisons of the consultants' personality types were made with a small sample of trade, industrial, and technical education teachers (N=36). This comparison

group showed a clear preference (66.7%) for introversion, which was a reversal of the attitude preferences expressed by each of the three previous groups and resulted in the consultants' showing a statistically significant preference for extraversion (E). The higher than expected frequencies of ENTJ types which occurred in the three previous comparisons disappeared in this instance, and were replaced by a higher than expected frequency of ESTJs and a lower than expected number of ISTJs among the consultants. Also showing statistical significance was the consultants' higher than expected preference for the extraversion-judging (EJ) combination and a lower preference for the introversion-sensing (IS) and introversion-judging (IJ) combinations. The EJ preference characterizes outgoing decision makers, while the lower than expected IS and IJ choices indicate fewer individuals who are typically contemplative, practical, and realistic.

Summary of the MBTI Data

In summary, when the questions posed in Chapter I were addressed, analyses of the data showed the following results:

1. The personality types of the consultants in the total population were well distributed among the 16 possible combinations of the MBTI. Only ESFP and INTP personality types were unrepresented. An analysis of the preferences on the four basic scales of the MBTI revealed that,

in one or more of the four comparisons, the consultants, as a group, were predominantly extraverted (E), sensing (S), and highly thinking (T) and judging (J). When compared by personality types, neither of the two sample subpopulations, incumbent consultants and recently departed consultants, was found to differ statistically significantly from the total sample population.

2. Chi-square comparisons of the quadrant distributions of consultants' personality types—identified as IS, IN, ES, and EN—with those of four samples of other educators produced no statistically significant differences. Further investigation of individual personality types by use of the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT) program showed differences between the consultants and each of the comparison groups.

3. The SRTT program indicated statistically significantly greater numbers of consultants with E-TJ personality types than were expected from comparisons with each of the other four educator groups. In three of the comparisons, the dominant E-TJ type was identified as ENTJ and in the fourth as ESTJ. Extraverted, thinking, feeling (E-TJ) personality types are considered outgoing, logical, decisive, critical, executive, and respectful of organization and efficiency. Intuitive (N) choices add elements of ingenuity and a bent for experimentation, while sensing (S) preferences contribute practicality and reliance upon experience (Myers, 1962).

4. Comparisons of the group preferences for each of the MBTI indices showed that in one or more of the four comparisons consultants had significantly higher preferences for E, T, J, and the combinations EJ, NT, NJ, ST, and TJ than did the other groups of educators. These are indices or combinations of indices composing the ENTJ and ESTJ personality types previously noted. As might be expected, the consultants also exhibited significantly lower preferences than did the other educator groups for I, F, P, and the combinations IJ, SF, NP, NF, FP, and IS, which indicated that there were fewer individuals than expected among the consultants whose preferences characterized them as independent, contemplative, enthusiastic, and insightful; spontaneous and innovative; and sympathetic and adaptable.

Role Effectiveness

The regional program administrators who annually evaluated the performance of the regional consultants provided their ratings of role effectiveness. Typically, the evaluations of elements which make up annual ratings congregated in the outstanding and above average categories, and a dichotomy was difficult to obtain. The regional program administrators were asked to examine the performance of consultants in the light of overall role effectiveness and to divide them into equal-numbered categories representing a more effective group and a less effective group, with no

implications of unsatisfactory or substandard performance. The resulting data are provided for the total consultant sample population and its two subpopulations, incumbent consultants and recently departed consultants. Frequencies and percentages of MBTI personality types in each of the two categories of role effectiveness are shown in Tables 8 through 10. The division of a small sample (N=45) into even smaller groups created a setting in which small changes created large effects; thus caution was exercised in drawing conclusions from these data.

Comparisons of the two groups in the total sample population and its two subpopulations drew attention to two distributions. No I--P personality types were represented in the more effective classifications, and almost three-fourths (73%) of the recently departed consultants were classified in the more effective group. Since the classifications of the consultants were a forced dichotomy derived from a population which was annually rated above average to outstanding, the absence of an IP preference among the more effective group could imply a lack of recognition for a group characterized as independent, introspective, and quietly efficient. Possibly lending to this result is the fact that individuals who prefer introversion-perception (IP) tend to be less visible and thus are prone to draw less attention to the results of their efforts.

Table 8

Personality Type and Role Effectiveness of All Consultants

Myers-Briggs type	More effective		Less effective	
	N	%	N	%
ISTJ	4	16.7	2	9.5
ISFJ	3	12.5	1	4.8
INFJ	1	4.2	0	0.0
INTJ	1	4.2	2	9.5
ISTP	0	0.0	1	4.8
ISFP	0	0.0	2	9.5
INFP	0	0.0	1	4.8
INTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTP	1	4.2	2	9.5
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	1	4.2	1	4.8
ENTP	1	4.2	0	0.0
ESTJ	6	25.0	2	9.5
ESFJ	1	4.2	2	9.5
ENFJ	0	0.0	2	9.5
ENTJ	5	20.8	3	14.3
Total	24		21	

Table 9

Personality Type and Role Effectiveness of Incumbent Consultants

Myers-Briggs type	More effective		Less effective	
	N	%	N	%
ISTJ	3	18.8	2	11.1
ISFJ	2	12.5	1	5.6
INFJ	1	6.2	0	0.0
INTJ	0	0.0	2	11.1
ISTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ISFP	0	0.0	2	11.1
INFP	0	0.0	1	5.6
INTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTP	1	6.2	2	11.1
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENTP	1	6.2	0	0.0
ESTJ	5	31.2	2	11.1
ESFJ	1	6.2	2	11.1
ENFJ	0	0.0	2	11.1
ENTJ	2	12.5	2	11.1
Total	16		18	

Table 10

Personality Type and Role Effectiveness of Recently Departed Consultants

Myers-Briggs type	More effective		Less effective	
	N	%	N	%
ISTJ	1	12.5	0	0.0
ISFJ	1	12.5	0	0.0
INFJ	0	0.0	0	0.0
INTJ	1	12.5	0	0.0
ISTP	0	0.0	1	33.3
ISFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
INFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
INTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	1	12.5	1	33.3
ENTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTJ	1	12.5	0	0.0
ESFJ	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFJ	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENTJ	3	37.5	1	33.3
Total	8		3	

An analysis of the data on the recently departed consultants (Table 10) confirmed a suggestion upon which the study was based, that many of the individuals who had left the consultant position were among the most effective. While it is admitted that 8 of 11 subjects (73%) constituted a tiny sample, it is significant that, of the more effective departed consultants examined, half preferred intuitive-thinking (NT) and three-fourths preferred thinking-judging (TJ). These indices identify individuals characterized as innovative, logical, and tough-minded executive types who value organization and efficiency.

Comparison of Personality Types Based on Role Effectiveness

The detailed comparisons of the SRTT program were applied to MBTI personality types in each of the classifications of role effectiveness derived from the total consultants sample population and the incumbent consultants subpopulation, but not to those from the recently departed consultant subpopulation because of their very low frequencies. The SRTT data (see Appendix A) indicate one statistically significant (.05 level) comparison—the absence of introvert-perceptive (IP) preferences among the more effective classification of the total sample population. The most noteworthy statistic was the virtual absence (1 of 44 analyses) of statistically significant relationships developed by the SRTT program. These data suggest that the distributions of MBTI personality types and the preferred indices among

consultants perceived as more effective and those perceived as less effective do not differ in statistically significant dimensions (other than the minor IP influence noted above) from distributions in the total sample population.

Job Satisfaction

Feelings of job satisfaction by the consultants were measured by the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) and were scored by the researcher. The JSQ consists of a 40-item self-report of the perceptions held by subjects of various characteristics of their jobs (see Appendix C). (A more comprehensive discussion of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire is included in the instrumentation section of Chapter 1.)

For purposes of statistical analysis, scores on the JSQ were recorded as values on a scale of 1 to 5 and were treated as continuous interval data. A score of 1 represented the very dissatisfied pole and a score of 5 the very satisfied pole. The data thus acquired from the JSQ scoring were investigated in two phases. First, the scores were examined for distribution and a determination of the MBTI personality types which made up a dichotomy of more satisfied and less satisfied consultants. Second, the SRTT program was used for personality type comparisons.

Results of cumulative scoring revealed populations of consultants who expressed general satisfaction with their jobs. The mean satisfaction score on all 40 of the job

characteristics for incumbents was 3.54 compared to 3.43 for the recently departed consultants. Both of these values contributed to the mean satisfaction score of 3.52 for the total sample population. Examination of the scoring distributions showed a negatively skewed curve for the total sample population and both of its subpopulations. The principal mode was in the "satisfied" interval in each group; however, the distribution of the subpopulation of recently departed consultants was bimodal with a lesser mode occurring in the "dissatisfied" interval. The secondary signal of dissatisfaction suggests a reason for departure or perhaps a freer expression of feelings about the job from those consultants who had moved on.

Tables 11 through 13 show the number and percentages of each MBTI personality type who expressed more satisfaction and less satisfaction with the job on all 40 job characteristics of the JSQ. These data are displayed for the total population of consultants and each of its subpopulations, with the median being used as the point of division to designate more and less satisfaction in each instance. When a distribution is negatively skewed, the extreme scores in the left tail tend to give the mean a low numerical value, and the hump to the right gives the mode a high numerical value. The median, least affected by either, is in the middle and provides the most typical score (Games & Klare, 1967). Data from Table 11 in the more satisfied classification of the

Table 11

Personality Type and Job Satisfaction of All Consultants

Myers-Briggs type	More satisfied		Less satisfied	
	N	%	N	%
ISTJ	2	9.1	3	13.6
ISFJ	3	13.6	1	4.5
INFJ	1	4.5	0	0.0
INTJ	0	0.0	3	13.6
ISTP	1	4.5	0	0.0
ISFP	2	9.1	0	0.0
INFP	1	4.5	0	0.0
INTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTP	0	0.0	3	13.6
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	1	4.5	1	4.5
ENTP	1	4.5	0	0.0
ESTJ	2	9.1	6	27.3
ESFJ	3	13.6	0	0.0
ENFJ	2	9.1	0	0.0
ENTJ	3	13.6	5	22.7
Total	22		22	

Note: One score coincided with the median which resulted in charted data for N=44.

Table 12

Personality Type and Job Satisfaction of Incumbent Consultants

Myers-Briggs type	More satisfied		Less satisfied	
	N	%	N	%
ISTJ	0	0.0	3	18.8
ISFJ	3	18.8	0	0.0
INFJ	1	6.2	0	0.0
INTJ	0	0.0	2	12.5
ISTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ISFP	1	6.2	1	6.2
INFP	1	6.2	0	0.0
INTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTP	0	0.0	3	18.8
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENTP	1	6.2	0	0.0
ESTJ	1	6.2	6	37.5
ESFJ	3	18.8	0	0.0
ENFJ	2	12.5	0	0.0
ENTJ	3	18.8	1	6.2
Total	16		16	

Note: Two scores coincided with the median which resulted in charted data for N=32.

Table 13

Personality Type and Job Satisfaction of Recently Departed Consultants

Myers-Briggs type	More satisfied		Less satisfied	
	N	%	N	%
ISTJ	1	20.0	0	0.0
ISFJ	0	0.0	1	20.0
INFJ	0	0.0	0	0.0
INTJ	1	20.0	0	0.0
ISTP	1	20.0	0	0.0
ISFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
INFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
INTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	1	20.0	1	20.0
ENTP	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESTJ	1	20.0	0	0.0
ESFJ	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFJ	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENTJ	0	0.0	3	60.0
Total	5		5	

Note: One score coincided with the median which resulted in charted data for N=10.

total consultant population present a noteworthy statistic. All of the I--P personality types occur in this more satisfied group. Small numbers diminish significance; however, this same group of I--P personality types all appeared in the less effective classification of role effectiveness. The data suggest that I--P types, characterized as quietly efficient and adaptable—are, in the case of the consultants, perhaps underrecognized for achievements yet adaptable to and satisfied with their jobs. These possibilities were pursued further by use of the SRTT program in later comparisons of personality types when relationships of role effectiveness and job satisfaction were examined.

A by-product of the examination of scoring frequencies on the JSQ was the identification of the job characteristics which brought forth the most frequent responses of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction from the consultants. These job characteristics were rank ordered for use in the second phase of the data investigation. The 10 principal sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are shown in Table 14. When consideration was given to the five possible areas from which job characteristics were selected—work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers—the rank-ordered table showed definite trends. The consultants' feelings of job satisfaction stemmed from the actual conduct of work and some of its conditions, relationships with co-workers, and to a lesser degree, supervision. Feelings of dissatisfaction

Table 14

Rank Order of the Principal Sources of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

Category	Item number	Job characteristic
Source of satisfaction	1	Physical working conditions
	17	Personal contact w/client
	39	Relationship w/co-workers
	18	Other communications w/clients
	19	Technical assistance to LEAs
	32	Quality of treatment by superiors
	2	Travel on the job
	4	Need for a reliable automobile
	12	Job security
	31	Evaluations of your performance
Source of dissatisfaction	11	Merit Pay
	9	Salary
	5	Travel budget to do the job
	14	Opportunity for promotion
	8	Job orientation
	27	Out-of-state travel policies
	38	Communications flow within
	10	Fringe benefits
	7	Reimbursement system for travel
	37	Organizational structure

were reported in the areas of pay, opportunity for promotion, and the conditions attendant to work activity rather than the conduct of the work itself.

Two statistics concerning the sources of job satisfaction were noteworthy from the raw data since they reflected almost total unanimity of feelings by the consultants:

1. No reports of dissatisfaction were recorded for two job characteristics—job security and relationships with co-workers.

2. Each of three other job characteristics—physical working conditions, personal contacts with clients, and other communications with clients—received only one report of dissatisfaction.

Comparison of Personality Types Based on Job Satisfaction

The Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT) program was used in the second phase of investigation of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire data. The significance of observed frequencies of MBTI personality types occurring in each classification (more satisfied and less satisfied) of job satisfaction, when compared to those predicted by the sample populations, was determined for the consultants total population and the subpopulation of incumbent consultants. (These data are presented in Appendix A.)

When the SRTT procedures were applied to the total population of consultants, statistically significant

differences in personality distributions were not shown. Among the incumbents, the absence of ISTJs in the more satisfied group and a higher than expected occurrence of ESTJs in the less satisfied group were considered statistically significant. The identification of -STJs as more apt to express job dissatisfactions may be a reflection of the reputation of this group as being individuals who are thorough, realistic, logical, decisive, critical, and who value efficiency and organization (Myers, 1962). Examination, by use of the SRTT program, of the basic scale indices of the MBTI and their combinations yielded results statistically significant to both populations. Those consultants who reported more job satisfaction also expressed higher than expected preferences for feeling (F) and the combinations SF and FJ in both populations, while expressing the expected lower preferences for thinking (T) and the combination ST and TJ. Differences between the more satisfied groups of the two populations occurred when incumbents reported higher than expected preferences for the EN and NF combinations and when a high IF preference was identified as statistically significant in the total population. The consultants in both populations who reported less job satisfaction expressed lower than expected preferences for feeling (F) and the SF and FJ combinations, while expressing higher preferences for thinking (T) and the ST and TJ combinations. It is noted that expressed preferences of the

less satisfied groups on these indices are the exact reversal of the expressions of the more satisfied groups in each population. These data suggest that the enthusiastic, insightful, sympathetic, executive types derived more satisfaction from their consultant jobs than did the practical, matter-of-fact, logical, tough-minded executive types. The more satisfied incumbents in addition displayed the EN and NF preferences, characteristic of individuals who are enthusiastic, insightful, and active innovators.

Comparison of Personality Types Based on Satisfaction with Specific Job Characteristics

By use of SRTT procedures, the consultants total population was subjected to further comparisons. Those consultants who recorded satisfaction scores or dissatisfaction scores on each of the job characteristics of the JSQ were identified by MBTI type. If a subject indicated "satisfied" or "very satisfied" (a score of 4 or 5 on the JSQ scale) he was classified as satisfied with that particular job characteristic. Conversely if a subject indicated "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" (a score of 1 or 2 on the JSQ scale), he was classified as dissatisfied with that particular characteristic. Neutral values (scores of 3) were not used in the classification. When the consultants were classified by MBTI personality type and job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, the SRTT procedures were applied for each of the 40 job characteristics of the JSQ. The

SRTT comparisons for the 10 principal sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are shown in Appendix A.

The following observations from the SRTT tables concerning the 10 principal sources of job satisfaction were considered of importance:

1. Because of a virtual unanimity of choice for the job characteristics which produced satisfactions, no statistically significant distributions of MBTI personality types were observed on any of the 10 job characteristics.

2. Statistically significant preferences for feeling (F) were reported by consultants who were satisfied with the quality of treatment by superiors and evaluations of performance. These people-oriented individuals value harmony in their relationships and tend to be adaptable and cooperative.

3. Preferences for sensing (S) and the SJ indices were significantly high among the group satisfied with technical assistance to LEAs. Since technical assistance is a major function of all consultants, it is noteworthy that the practical, organized, experience-oriented individuals derived the greatest satisfaction from this job characteristic; also noteworthy was the absence of intuitive (N), NT, and NJ types who are characteristically motivated by challenges of innovation, investigation, and new frontiers.

A review of the SRTT tables concerned with the 10 principal sources of dissatisfaction revealed the following results:

1. A significantly higher than expected occurrence of ESTJ personality types was indicated on three job characteristics—fringe benefits, travel budget to do the job, and out-of-state travel policies.

2. Significantly higher than expected frequencies of thinking (T), ST, or TJ preferences along with the previously mentioned ESTJ personality types were observed on 8 of the 10 principal sources of dissatisfaction. These choices represent the practical organizers who like to get things done. The thinking-judging (TJ) combination occurred most often (6 times) and is characteristic of persons who are objective, impersonal, base decisions on facts, and have a need to be treated fairly. Since they are naturally critical and the most tough minded, it is perhaps to be expected that feelings of dissatisfaction are most readily expressed by those who prefer thinking-judging (TJ).

Association of Role Effectiveness with Job Satisfaction

The association of role effectiveness and job satisfaction was sought for the consultants total population and the subpopulation of incumbent consultants. Point biserial correlation coefficients were generated for the relationship between the dichotomy of consultants' role

effectiveness and the continuous job satisfaction scores recorded on each of the 20 job characteristics which made up the leading sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. (The data for both of the samples tested are shown in Table 15.)

Correlation coefficients ranged from a negative value of -.194 to a positive value of .448. Four positive correlations were found to be statistically significant, each relating to the consultants rated as more effective and their positive feelings of job satisfaction. The job characteristics identified from the JSQ were

17. Personal contact w/clients
18. Other communications w/clients
32. Quality of treatment by supervisors
31. Evaluation of performance.

No statistically significant correlation coefficients were found representing role effectiveness and job dissatisfaction. Williams (Note 1) reported a lack of convincing evidence of the existence of a direct cause-effect relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. She speculated that the contributions of job satisfaction were indirect and were reflected more in reductions of negative actions than in increased effectiveness on the job. While no cause-effect relationships could be suggested in the present study, a weak positive association appeared to prevail between the consultants' role effectiveness and and positive feelings of job satisfaction.

Table 15

Point Biserial Correlations of Role Effectiveness with Sources of Job Satisfaction

Job characteristic		Correlation coefficient	
		All Consultants r_{pbi}	Incumbents r_{pbi}
1.	Physical working conditions	-.023	-.152
17.	Personal contact w/ clients	.367	.448
39.	Relationship w/co-workers	.138	.038
18.	Other communications w/clients	.365	.412
19.	Technical assistance to LEAs	.047	.023
32.	Quality of treatment by supr.	.328	.339
2.	Travel on the job	-.088	.008
4.	Need for reliable auto	.005	-.003
12.	Job security	.038	.146
31.	Evaluation of performance	.224	.296
11.	Merit pay	.058	.210
9.	Salary	-.141	.030
5.	Travel budget to do the job	.045	-.043
14.	Opportunity for promotion	.048	.115
8.	Job orientation	-.194	-.037
27.	Out-of-state travel policies	-.068	-.149
38.	Communications flow within	.010	.000
10.	Fringe benefits	-.061	.073
7.	Reimbursement system for trav.	.210	.158
37.	Organizational structure	-.015	-.076
40.	Satisfaction most of the time	.204	.251

One additional correlation was sought for the relationship between role effectiveness and overall satisfaction (satisfaction most of the time). Point biserial correlation coefficients for both populations proved to be statistically nonsignificant. The highest correlation value was a positive .251 for the incumbents.

None of the previous tests of association had considered personality types; however, it was possible by use of the SRTT program to compare MBTI personality types occuring in a two-by-two contingency table on role effectiveness and job satisfaction. In the two samples tested, the total consultant population and the incumbent consultant population, most (13 of 15) of the statistically significant departures from the expected distribution of personality types occurred in one cell, that of the consultants classified as more satisfied and less effective. These departures substantially mirrored the data previously reported in the job satisfaction section for the more satisfied groups, and were not further analyzed since personality types were not at issue in the question of association under investigation. (These data are shown in Appendix A.)

Summary Discussion of the Data

The task of identifying specific personality characteristics which can be associated with effective behavior among administrative educators has proved to be an elusive goal. The results of this study are as inconclusive as are those

of many other studies which have attempted to measure teacher personality and its relationship to teacher effectiveness. In 1955 Getzels identified three major obstacles to real progress in research in the area—the problems of definition, instrumentation, and criterion. These problem areas continue to exist in varying degrees because of the many definitions of personality, some based upon theory (e.g., trait theory or need theory), others based upon concepts relevant to the dynamic definitions of personality (e.g., attitude, value, or adjustment). The development of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1962) provided a means of measuring Jung's theoretical personalities. However, the criticism that no two personality tests measure the same thing appears as valid today as when Getzels advanced the idea.

The question of the criterion of effectiveness is the most intransigent of problems. In the present study no statistically significant differences were observed in personality types between the consultants rated "more effective" and those related "less effective." One of the admitted limitations of the study was that an empirical basis for determining effectiveness was not possible. The role of expert was reasonably cast upon the regional program administrators, who had annually rated the consultants over a period of several years. Annual ratings were based upon widely accepted norms of effectiveness for Florida Career

Service employees, and regional administrators were considered to be in the best position to provide the ratings. The orderly process through which "more effective" and "less effective" groups were classified resulted in two groups representing different levels of effectiveness in the opinion of the writer.

Although this study did not discover statistically significant differences in the personality types of consultants rated more effective and less effective, the comparisons with other educator groups demonstrated statistically significant results, with the consultants showing a greater than expected number of extraverted (E), intuitive (N), thinking (T), judging (J) personalities than occurred in three comparison groups. Whether these differences are basic personality type differences or are the result of selectivity resulting from several years of experience in different roles remains a matter of speculation. The strong thinking (T) and judging (J) group preferences of the consultants generally supported the research review of Hoffman and Betkouski (1981), which examined supervisors and administrators identified by Jungian type theory.

In the present study of personality and job satisfaction, statistically significant differences in personality types were identified among the incumbent consultants. Individuals who preferred sensing (S), thinking (T), and judging (J) were more apt to express dissatisfactions, and

it was possible to identify sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction from the job characteristics of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ). The JSQ, as a self-developed questionnaire, may be suspect among some researchers. Therefore, it seems appropriate to report that it was developed by the researcher with the additional perspective of over 10 years' recent experience in the role of a regional program consultant. The JSQ has the limitation of being very specific to the consultants' position and thus subject to the previously mentioned criticism of Getzels (1955).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been widely used as a measure of the preferences which make up Jungian personality types. As McCaulley (1977) pointed out, psychological type cannot predict or explain all of any individual's behavior, nor does it indicate that all persons of any given type are alike. The degree of development of individual preferences remains an unknown as well as the focus of an expressed preference.

The data from this study, simply stated, indicate that the search must go beyond the personality types and characteristics reported herein to identify consultant effectiveness. As Biddle and Ellena (1964) stated, the lack of success in literally hundreds of research efforts in this area lies in the complexity of the problem. Too many other influences exist to permit a simple association of successful

accomplishment with a set of personality variables. Fiedler (in Stogdill, 1974) conceived a contingency theory of leadership which was based upon the belief that effective behavior is contingent upon the events introduced by a given situation. Perhaps it is more realistic to view consultants' effective behavior and the feelings of satisfaction derived from it in a similar context rather than attempt to identify some set of characteristics associated with effectiveness and job satisfaction in all work situations. A further development of type theory which quantifies some of the yet unknown qualities of individual preference under variable conditions could move in this direction.

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This study dealt with the identification of personality characteristics of regional vocational education program consultants and whether the characteristics of effective consultants differed from those of less effective consultants. Additional information was sought concerning job satisfactions and their possible association with the consultants' personality characteristics and role effectiveness.

Self-report questionnaires were used to gather data to determine consultants' personality types and feelings of job satisfaction, while ratings by regional program administrators determined their role effectiveness. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and a researcher-developed Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) were the instruments administered in five regional offices in Florida in the data-gathering process.

Findings

Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What are the personality types of regional consultants?

2. How do the personalities of the consultants compare with those of other educator groups?

3. Do the personalities of effective consultants differ from the personalities of less effective consultants?

4. Are the personalities of consultants reporting job satisfaction different from those of consultants reporting dissatisfaction?

5. What is the association of role effectiveness and job satisfaction among consultants?

In dealing with the first four of these questions, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator responses were used for identification of personality types, the letter indices of the four basic scales of the MBTI providing the medium for statistical comparisons and data presentations. Cross-tabs and the Selection Ratio Type Table (SRTT) computer programs were used for comparisons and correlations. A 95% confidence level was sought in these statistics.

The consultants' personality distribution was within the norms established for comparable groups with similar levels of education and responsibility. Subpopulations of incumbent consultants and recently departed consultants were found to be homogeneous with the total sample population.

The consultants as a group were found to be extraverted (E), sensing (S), and highly thinking (T) and judging (J).

Comparisons of personality types with four groups of educators indicated a higher than expected occurrence among the consultants of E-TJ types. The ENTJ personality type was identified in three of these comparisons and the ESTJ personality type, in the fourth.

The investigation of personality type differences between more and less effective consultants revealed no statistically significant data. It was found that among the recently departed consultants nearly three-fourths (73%) were rated as more effective.

Responses to the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) indicated a high degree of general satisfaction by the consultants with their jobs. In the areas covered by the JSQ—work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers—consultants expressed satisfaction with work, relationships with co-workers, and supervision, while they expressed dissatisfaction with pay, promotion, and some conditions under which work was conducted. In comparisons of personality types, more statistically significant relationships were found among consultants expressing dissatisfaction than among those expressing satisfaction. Sensing (S) and, especially, thinking (T) and judging (J) predominated among the consultants expressing dissatisfaction.

Statistically significant positive correlations were found between consultants' ratings of effectiveness and their expressions of satisfaction for job characteristics in the areas of supervision and work.

Conclusions

The statistical data developed in this study led to the following conclusions:

1. The consultants displayed personality characteristics within the norms established for individuals of comparable levels of education and responsibility.

2. The consultants differed in distributions of personality with four comparison groups of educators—high school teachers; secondary supervisory teachers; adult education teachers; and trade, industrial, and technical education teachers.

3. Consultants rated more effective in the conduct of their role did not differ in personality type distributions from consultants rated less effective.

4. The consultants were satisfied with their jobs; however, they showed differences in personality type distributions between more satisfied and less satisfied groups when specific job characteristics were considered.

5. A positive association was established between consultants' role effectiveness and feelings of job satisfaction in 4 of 21 tests.

Implications

The difficulties of measuring anything with the complexity of human personality were pointed out by McCaulley (1977) along with some of the limitations of the MBTI as an instrument of such measurement. Psychological type

cannot predict or explain all of any individual's behavior, nor does it indicate that all persons of any given type are alike. Group preferences cannot indicate the focus of individual preferences nor the degree of development of those preferences.

Thus, the differences demonstrated by the regional consultants when compared to other educator groups are probably to be expected. The screening processes which occur in career movement from the classroom to positions of supervision and administration probably account for the higher incidences of thinking and judging personality characteristics reported in this study as well as in supporting research on educational administrators. Wright (1966) recommended the use of personality typing for selection in hiring; however, the findings of this study indicate that, while knowledge of type could be useful for other purposes, it would not be an appropriate measure for judging the role effectiveness of regional consultants. Too many unrecognized influences on performance apparently compensate for personality type differences and their possible association with effectiveness.

In studying the regional consultant role, Trapnell (1977) concluded that it was two-dimensional—first, involving meeting institutional needs, and, second, essential to the satisfaction of personal needs. According to Trapnell, "The greatest productivity, efficiency,

effectiveness, and harmony can be achieved when these two dimensions are comgruent so that an individual receives the greatest satisfaction in doing what he is expected to do" (p. 151).

The expressions of satisfaction toward the various job characteristics by consultants of differing personalities perhaps offer some implications for consideration by those in management and leadership positions. It should be reassuring to supervising administrators that consultants uniformily expressed satisfaction for work, supervision, and relationships with co-workers. These expressions of satisfaction were offset by indications of dissatisfaction with pay, opportunity for promotion, and some conditions of work, which imply reasons for the loss of some of the most effective consultants.

The review of personality types and sources of job satisfaction in this study suggests the following areas for further investigation:

1. Personality type differences among the consultants representing specific vocational program areas. Are the consultants different and, if so, does their difference affect their consultative services and technical assistance to clients?

2. Organizational structure as it affects efficiency and the flow of communications and implementation of policy. Are the dissatisfactions brought out in this study outgrowths of the internal organization?

3. Personality type differences between consultants and their administrative leaders, and their effects on role perception and job performance. Do leadership and management styles as well as personalities affect consultants' role perceptions and job performance?

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Williams, M. R. Work. Unpublished manuscript, 1975. (Available from the library of the Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc., Gainesville, Florida).

2. Program of work. Unpublished annual document. (Division of Vocational Education, Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida).

3. McCaulley, M. H. Introduction to the MBTI for researchers. (Excerpt from Application of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to medicine and other health professions, 1977), Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc., 1980.

REFERENCES

Biddle, B. J., & Ellena, W. J. (Eds.). Contemporary research on teacher effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Bochman, V. M. The Herzberg controversy. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 155-189.

Damico, S., & Dalsheimer, B. The relationship of personality type to achievement on the Florida Twelfth Grade Statewide Placement Test (Technical Report No. 1). Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, College of Education, P. K. Yonge Laboratory School, May, 1974.

Gage, N. L. (Ed.). Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Games, P. A., & Klare, G. R. Elementary statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Getzels, J. W. Educational news and editorial comment (Necessity and innovation in the selection and training of teachers). Elementary School Journal, 1955, 55, 427-434.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Groseth, R. S. An investigation of the motivator-hygiene theory of job satisfaction among selected student affairs administrators (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 1952A. (University Microfilms No. 7817439)

Hamachek, D. Characteristics of good teachers and implications for teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, 50, 341-345.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley Press, 1959.

Hoffman, J. L. Personality relationships between supervising teachers and student teachers as determined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 830A-831A. (University Microfilms No. 75-16, 393)

Hoffman, J. L., & Betkouski, M. A summary of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator research applications in education. Research in Psychological Type, 1981, 3, 3-41.

Hurst, S. C. Psychological types of students and instructors: The effect of similarity on their evaluations, each of the other, in selected health related programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37, 6367A. (University Microfilms No. 77-8188)

Jung, C. G. (Ed.). Man and his symbols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Jung, C. G. [Psychological types] (H. G. Baynes, trans., & R. F. C. Hull, Ed.). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971. (Origianlly published, 1921.)

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M. Y. Educational Administration: An Introduction. New York: Macmillan, 1976.

Kozal, A. P. An application of the reformulated (Herzberg) theory of job satisfaction to selected administrative affairs staff in the Florida State University System (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 1788A. (University Microfilms No. 7921934)

Laney, A. R. Occupational implications of the Jungian personality function-types as identified by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Unpublished master's thesis, George Washington University, 1949.

Lawrence, G. MBTI responses from 661 elementary and middle school teachers. CAPT data bank, Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc., 1974.

Lawrence, G. People types and tiger stripes: A practical guide to learning styles. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological type, Inc., 1979.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper, 1954.

McCaulley, M. H. Applications of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to medicine and other health professions: Monograph 1 (Contract No. 231-76-0051 Health Resources Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc., 1977.

McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Morrison, M. J. A study of principal leadership style and personality preference type (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 41, 484A. (University Microfilms No. 8016674)

Murray, H. A. Explorations in personality. Oxford University Press, 1938.

Myers, I. B. Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962, 1975.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Stogdill, R. M. Handbook of leadership; A survey of theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Thomas, S. C. An application of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction to selected community college administrative roles (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 3326A. (University Microfilms No. 77-25, 958)

Trapnell, G. Perceptions of the roles of regional vocational education program consultants in Florida (Project No. VTAD-5 70233). Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1977.

Von Fange, E. A. Implications for school administration of the personality structure of educational personnel. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.

Vroom, V. Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Wright, J. A. The relationship of rated administrator and teacher effectiveness to personality as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 28, 981A. (University Microfilms No. 67-10, 765).

APPENDIX A
SELECTION RATIO TYPE TABLES

Table A-1

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Incumbents

N=34

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N = 5 % = 14.71 I= 1.10	N = 3 % = 8.82 I= 0.99	N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	N = 2 % = 5.85 I= 0.88	
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	INTROVERTS
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 2 % = 5.88 I= 1.32	N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	
N = 3 % = 8.82 I= 1.32	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	PERCEPTIVE
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	EXTRAVERTS
N = 7 % = 20.59 I= 1.16	N = 3 % = 8.82 I= 1.32	N = 2 % = 5.88 I= 1.32	N = 4 % = 11.75 I= 0.66	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	20	58.82	0.98
I	14	41.18	1.03
S	23	67.65	1.13
N	11	32.35	0.81
T	22	64.71	0.97
F	12	35.29	1.06
J	27	79.41	1.02
P	7	20.59	0.93
IJ	11	32.35	1.04
IP	3	8.82	0.99
EP	4	11.76	0.88
EJ	16	47.06	1.01
ST	15	44.12	1.10
SF	8	23.53	1.18
NF	4	11.76	0.88
NT	7	20.59	0.77
SJ	18	52.94	1.13
SP	5	14.71	1.10
NP	2	5.88	0.66
NJ	9	26.47	0.85
TJ	18	52.94	0.95
TP	4	11.76	1.06
FP	3	8.82	0.79
FJ	9	26.47	1.19
IN	4	11.76	1.06
EN	7	20.59	0.71
IS	10	29.41	1.02
ES	13	38.24	1.23

NOTES:

Table A-2

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Recently Departed Consultants

N=11

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 1 % = 9.09 I= 0.68	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 9.09 I= 1.02	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 1 % = 9.09 I= 1.36	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 9.09 I= 4.09	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 18.18 I= 4.09	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 1 % = 9.09 I= 0.51	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 4 % = 36.36 I= 2.05	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	7	63.64	1.06
I	4	36.36	0.91
S	4	36.36	0.61
N	7	63.64	1.59
T	8	72.73	1.09
F	3	27.27	0.82
J	8	72.73	0.94
P	3	27.27	1.23
IJ	3	27.27	0.88
IP	1	9.09	1.02
EP	2	18.18	1.36
EJ	5	45.45	0.97
ST	3	27.27	0.68
SF	1	9.09	0.45
NF	2	18.18	1.36
NT	5	45.45	1.70
SJ	3	27.27	0.58
SP	1	9.09	0.68
NP	2	18.18	2.05
NJ	5	45.45	1.46
TJ	7	63.64	1.15
TP	1	9.09	0.82
FP	2	18.18	1.64
FJ	1	9.09	0.41
IN	1	9.09	0.82
EN	6	54.55	1.89
IS	3	27.27	0.94
ES	1	9.09	0.29

NOTES:

Table A-3

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: All Consultants and High School Teachers from CAPT Data Bank

N=45

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 13.33 I= 1.05	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 8.89 I= 0.76	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.32	*INTJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 1.49	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 1.35	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 1.58	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.41	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 5.68"	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 0.36	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.63	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 8 % = 17.78 I= 1.80	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 0.77	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 0.51	*ENTJ* N = 8 % =17.78 I= 4.21*	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	27	60.00	1.17
I	18	40.00	0.82
S	27	60.00	1.17
N	18	40.00	0.82
T	30	66.67	1.64*
F	15	33.33	0.56*
J	35	77.78	1.15
P	10	22.22	0.68
IJ	14	31.11	0.87
IP	4	8.89	0.69
EP	6	13.33	0.68
EJ	21	46.67	1.48"
ST	18	40.00	1.58"
SF	9	20.00	0.77
NF	6	13.33	0.40#
NT	12	26.67	1.75"
SJ	21	46.67	1.09
SP	6	13.33	1.58
NP	4	8.89	0.37"
NJ	14	31.11	1.27
TJ	25	55.56	1.78*
TP	5	11.11	1.18
FP	5	11.11	0.48
FJ	10	22.22	0.61
IN	5	11.11	0.56
EN	13	28.89	1.01
IS	13	28.89	1.00
ES	14	31.11	1.38

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-4

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: All Consultants and Hoffman Secondary Supervisory Teachers

N=45

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 13.33 I= 0.80	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 8.89 I= 0.93	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.47	*INTJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 1.40	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 1.87	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.93	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 5.60	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 0.93	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.31	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 8 % =17.78 I= 1.07	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 0.47	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 0.53	*ENTJ* N = 8 % =17.78 I= 4.98#	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	27	60.00	1.05
I	18	40.00	0.93
S	27	60.00	0.97
N	18	40.00	1.05
T	30	66.67	1.27
F	15	33.33	0.70
J	35	77.78	0.99
P	10	22.22	1.04
IJ	14	31.11	0.87
IP	4	8.89	1.24
EP	6	13.33	0.93
EJ	21	46.67	1.09
ST	18	40.00	1.16
SF	9	20.00	0.73
NF	6	13.33	0.66
NT	12	26.67	1.49
SJ	21	46.67	0.82
SP	6	13.33	2.80
NP	4	8.89	0.53
NJ	14	31.11	1.45
TJ	25	55.56	1.33
TP	5	11.11	1.04
FP	5	11.11	1.04
FJ	10	22.22	0.60
IN	5	11.11	0.78
EN	13	28.89	1.21
IS	13	28.89	1.01
ES	14	31.11	0.93

NOTES: # implies significance at the .01 level.

Table A-5

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Adult Education Teachers from CAPT Data Bank

N=45

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 13.33 I= 1.38	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 8.89 I= 0.75	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.83	*INTJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 4.13	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.46	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 1.03	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.32	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 2.07	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 0.52	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.59	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 8 % = 17.78 I= 1.57	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 0.48	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 1.18	*ENTJ* N = 8 % = 17.78 I= 3.01#	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	27	60.00	1.07
I	18	40.00	0.91
S	27	60.00	0.93
N	18	40.00	1.13
T	30	66.67	1.57#
F	15	33.33	0.58#
J	35	77.78	1.28"
P	10	22.22	0.57"
IJ	14	31.11	1.21
IP	4	8.89	0.49
EP	6	13.33	0.64
EJ	21	46.67	1.34
ST	18	40.00	1.38
SF	9	20.00	0.56"
NF	6	13.33	0.60
NT	12	26.67	1.98"
SJ	21	46.67	1.00
SP	6	13.33	0.75
NP	4	8.89	0.41
NJ	14	31.11	2.23#
TJ	25	55.56	1.95*
TP	5	11.11	0.79
FP	5	11.11	0.44"
FJ	10	22.22	0.69
IN	5	11.11	0.83
EN	13	28.89	1.31
IS	13	28.89	0.94
ES	14	31.11	0.92

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-6

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: All Consultants and Trade, Industrial, and Technical Teachers from CAPT Data Bank

N=45

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 13.33 I= 0.28*	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 8.89 I= 3.20	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.40	*INTJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 1.60	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.80	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 6.67 I= 1.20	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.44 I= 0.80	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.22 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 8 % = 17.78 0.0#	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 6.67 2.40	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.44 1.60	*ENTJ* N = 8 % = 17.78 1.60	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	27	60.00	1.80"
I	18	40.00	0.60"
S	27	60.00	0.90
N	18	40.00	1.20
T	30	66.67	0.96
F	15	33.33	1.09
J	35	77.78	1.08
P	10	22.22	0.80
IJ	14	31.11	0.56"
IP	4	8.89	0.80
EP	6	13.33	0.80
EJ	21	46.67	2.80#
ST	18	40.00	0.76
SF	9	20.00	1.44
NF	6	13.33	0.80
NT	12	26.67	1.60
SJ	21	46.67	0.88
SP	6	13.33	0.96
NP	4	8.89	0.64
NJ	14	31.11	1.60
TJ	25	55.56	0.95
TP	5	11.11	1.00
FP	5	11.11	0.67
FJ	10	22.22	1.60
IN	5	11.11	0.80
EN	13	28.89	1.49
IS	13	28.89	0.55"
ES	14	31.11	2.24

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-7

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Rated More Effective

N=24

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 16.67 I= 1.25	*ISFJ* N = 3 % = 12.50 I= 1.41	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 4.17 I= 1.88	*INTJ* N = 1 % = 4.17 I= 0.63	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 4.17 I= 0.63	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.17 I= 0.94	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 4.17 I= 1.88	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 6 % = 25.00 I= 1.41	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 4.17 I= 0.63	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 5 % = 20.83 I= 1.17	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	15	62.50	1.04
I	9	37.50	0.94
S	15	62.50	1.04
N	9	37.50	0.94
T	18	75.00	1.13
F	6	25.00	0.75
J	21	87.50	1.13
P	3	12.50	0.56
IJ	9	37.50	1.21
IP	0	0.0	0.0 "
EP	3	12.50	0.94
EJ	12	50.00	1.07
ST	11	45.83	1.15
SF	4	16.67	0.83
NF	2	8.33	0.63
NT	7	29.17	1.09
SJ	14	58.33	1.25
SP	1	4.17	0.31
NP	2	8.33	0.94
NJ	7	29.17	0.94
TJ	16	66.67	1.20
TP	2	8.33	0.75
FP	1	4.17	0.38
FJ	5	20.83	0.94
IN	2	8.33	0.75
EN	7	29.17	1.01
IS	7	29.17	1.01
ES	8	33.33	1.07

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-8

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Rated Less Effective

N=21

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 0.71	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 0.54	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 1.43	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 2.14	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 2.14	*INFP* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 2.14	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 1.43	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 1.07	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 0.54	*ESFJ* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 1.43	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 2.14	*ENTJ* N = 3 % =14.29 I= 0.80	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	12	57.14	0.95
I	9	42.86	1.07
S	12	57.14	0.95
N	9	42.86	1.07
T	12	57.14	0.86
F	9	42.86	1.29
J	14	66.67	0.86
P	7	33.33	1.50
IJ	5	23.81	0.77
IP	4	19.05	2.14"
EP	3	14.29	1.07
EJ	9	42.86	0.92
ST	7	33.33	0.83
SF	5	23.81	1.19
NF	4	19.05	1.43
NT	5	23.81	0.89
SJ	7	33.33	0.71
SP	5	23.81	1.79
NP	2	9.52	1.07
NJ	7	33.33	1.07
TJ	9	42.86	0.77
TP	3	14.29	1.29
FP	4	19.05	1.71
FJ	5	23.81	1.07
IN	3	14.29	1.29
EN	6	28.57	0.99
IS	6	28.57	0.99
ES	6	28.57	0.92

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-9

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants Rated More Effective

N=16

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 1.27	*ISFJ* N = 2 % = 12.50 I= 1.42	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.13	*INTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 0.71	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.13	EXTRAVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTJ N = 5 % = 31.25 I= 1.52	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 0.71	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 2 % =12.50 I= 1.06	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	10	62.50	1.06
I	6	37.50	0.91
S	12	75.00	1.11
N	4	25.00	0.77
T	12	75.00	1.16
F	4	25.00	0.71
J	14	87.50	1.10
P	2	12.50	0.61
IJ	6	37.50	1.16
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	2	12.50	1.06
EJ	8	50.00	1.06
ST	9	56.25	1.27
SF	3	18.75	0.80
NF	1	6.25	0.53
NT	3	18.75	0.91
SJ	11	68.75	1.30
SP	1	6.25	0.42
NP	1	6.25	1.06
NJ	3	18.75	0.71
TJ	10	62.50	1.18
TP	2	12.50	1.06
FP	0	0.0	0.0
FJ	4	25.00	0.94
IN	1	6.25	0.53
EN	3	18.75	0.91
IS	5	31.25	1.06
ES	7	43.75	1.14

NOTES:

Table A-10

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants Rated Less Effective

N=18

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 0.76	N = 1 % = 5.56 I= 0.63	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 1.89	
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	PERCEPTIVE
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 1.89	N = 1 % = 5.56 I= 1.89	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	PERCEPTIVE
N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 1.26	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	JUDGING
N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 0.54	N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 1.26	N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 1.89	N = 2 % = 11.11 I= 0.94	

INTROVERTS

EXTRAVERTS

	N	%	I
E	10	55.56	0.94
I	8	44.44	1.08
S	11	61.11	0.90
N	7	38.89	1.20
T	10	55.56	0.86
F	8	44.44	1.26
J	13	72.22	0.91
P	5	27.78	1.35
IJ	5	27.78	0.86
IP	3	16.67	1.89
EP	2	11.11	0.94
EJ	8	44.44	0.94
ST	6	33.33	0.76
SF	5	27.78	1.18
NF	3	16.67	1.42
NT	4	22.22	1.08
SJ	7	38.89	0.73
SP	4	22.22	1.51
NP	1	5.56	0.94
NJ	6	33.33	1.26
TJ	8	44.44	0.84
TP	2	11.11	0.94
FP	3	16.67	1.89
FJ	5	27.78	1.05
IN	3	16.67	1.42
EN	4	22.22	1.08
IS	5	27.78	0.94
ES	6	33.33	0.87

NOTES:

Table A-11

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants More Satisfied

N=22

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 0.68	*ISFJ* N = 3 % = 13.64 I= 1.53	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 2.05	*INTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 2.05	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 2.05	*INFP* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 2.05	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 1.02	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 2.05	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 0.51	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 13.64 I= 2.05	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 2.05	*ENTJ* N = 3 % = 13.64 I= 0.77	JUDGING

	N	%	I	
E	12	54.55	0.91	
I	10	45.45	1.14	
S	13	59.09	0.98	
N	9	40.91	1.02	
T	9	40.91	0.61*	
F	13	59.09	1.77*	
J	16	72.73	0.94	
P	6	27.27	1.23	
IJ	6	27.27	0.88	
IP	4	18.18	2.05"	
EP	2	9.09	0.68	
EJ	10	45.45	0.97	
ST	5	22.73	0.57"	
SF	8	36.36	1.82#	
NF	5	22.73	1.70	
NT	4	18.18	0.68	
SJ	10	45.45	0.97	
SP	3	13.64	1.02	
NP	3	13.64	1.53	
NJ	6	27.27	0.88	
TJ	7	31.82	0.57#	
TP	2	9.09	0.82	
FP	4	18.18	1.64	
FJ	9	40.91	1.84#	
IN	2	9.09	0.82	
EN	7	31.82	1.10	
IS	8	36.36	1.26	
ES	5	22.73	0.73	

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-12

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency of Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Less Satisfied

N=22

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 3 % = 13.64 I= 1.02	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 0.51	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 3 % =13.64 I= 2.05	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 13.64 I= 2.05	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 1.02	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 6 % = 27.27 I= 1.53	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 5 % =22.73 I= 1.28	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	15	68.18	1.14
I	7	31.82	0.80
S	13	59.09	0.98
N	9	40.91	1.02
T	20	90.91	1.36#
F	2	9.09	0.27#
J	18	81.82	1.05
P	4	18.18	0.82
IJ	7	31.82	1.02
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	4	18.18	1.36
EJ	11	50.00	1.07
ST	12	54.55	1.36
SF	1	4.55	0.23"
NF	1	4.55	0.34
NT	8	36.36	1.36
SJ	10	45.45	0.97
SP	3	13.64	1.02
NP	1	4.55	0.51
NJ	8	36.36	1.17
TJ	17	77.27	1.39#
TP	3	13.64	1.23
FP	1	4.55	0.41
FJ	1	4.55	0.20#
IN	3	13.64	1.23
EN	6	27.27	0.94
IS	4	18.18	0.63
ES	9	40.91	1.31

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.

Table A-13

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants More Satisfied

N=16

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0"	*ISFJ* N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 2.13	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.13	*INTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 1.06	*INFP* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.13	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.13	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 0.30	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 2.13	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 12.50 I= 2.13	*ENTJ* N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 1.59	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	10	62.50	1.06
I	6	37.50	0.91
S	8	50.00	0.74
N	8	50.00	1.55
T	5	31.25	0.48*
F	11	68.75	1.95*
J	13	81.25	1.02
P	3	18.75	0.91
IJ	4	25.00	0.77
IP	2	12.50	1.42
EP	1	6.25	0.53
EJ	9	56.25	1.20
ST	1	6.25	0.14*
SF	7	43.75	1.86"
NF	4	25.00	2.13"
NT	4	25.00	1.21
SJ	7	43.75	0.83
SP	1	6.25	0.42
NP	2	12.50	2.13
NJ	6	37.50	1.42
TJ	4	25.00	0.47#
TP	1	6.25	0.53
FP	2	12.50	1.42
FJ	9	56.25	2.13*
IN	2	12.50	1.06
EN	6	37.50	1.82"
IS	4	25.00	0.85
ES	4	25.00	0.65

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-14

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants Less Satisfied

N=16

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 1.27	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 2 % =12.50 I= 2.13	
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 1.06	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 2.13	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	JUDGING
N = 6 % = 37.50 I= 1.82"	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 0.53	

	N	%	I
E	10	62.50	1.06
I	6	37.50	0.91
S	13	81.25	1.20
N	3	18.75	0.58
T	15	93.75	1.45#
F	1	6.25	0.18#
J	12	75.00	0.94
P	4	25.00	1.21
IJ	5	31.25	0.97
IP	1	6.25	0.71
EP	3	18.75	1.59
EJ	7	43.75	0.93
ST	12	75.00	1.70#
SF	1	6.25	0.27"
NF	0	0.0	0.0
NT	3	18.75	0.91
SJ	9	56.25	1.06
SP	4	25.00	1.70
NP	0	0.0	0.0
NJ	3	18.75	0.71
TJ	12	75.00	1.42"
TP	3	18.75	1.59
FP	1	6.25	0.71
FJ	0	0.0	0.0 #
IN	2	12.50	1.06
EN	1	6.25	0.30
IS	4	25.00	0.85
ES	9	56.25	1.47

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-15

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants
Satisifed with Working Conditions

N=43

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 13.95 I= 1.05	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 9.30 I= 1.05	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.33 I= 1.05	*INTJ* N = 3 % = 6.98 I= 1.05	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.33 I= 1.05	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.65 I= 1.05	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.33 I= 1.05	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 6.98 I= 1.05	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.65 I= 1.05	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.33 I= 1.05	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 16.28 I= 0.92	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 6.98 I= 1.05	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.65 I= 1.05	*ENTJ* N = 7 % =16.28 I= 0.92	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	25	58.14	0.97
I	18	41.86	1.05
S	26	60.47	1.01
N	17	39.53	0.99
T	28	65.12	0.98
F	15	34.88	1.05
J	33	76.74	0.99
P	10	23.26	1.05
IJ	14	32.56	1.05
IP	4	9.30	1.05
EP	6	13.95	1.05
EJ	19	44.19	0.95
ST	17	39.53	0.99
SF	9	20.93	1.05
NF	6	13.95	1.05
NT	11	25.58	0.96
SJ	20	46.51	1.00
SP	6	13.95	1.05
NP	4	9.30	1.05
NJ	13	30.23	0.97
TJ	23	53.49	0.96
TP	5	11.63	1.05
FP	5	11.63	1.05
FJ	10	23.26	1.05
IN	5	11.63	1.05
EN	12	27.91	0.97
IS	13	30.23	1.05
ES	13	30.23	0.97

NOTES:

Table A-16

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied with
Personal Contact with Clients

N=40

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 15.00 I= 1.13	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 10.00 I= 1.13	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.50 I= 1.13	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 5.00 I= 0.75	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.50 I= 1.13	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 5.00 I= 1.13	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.50 I= 1.13	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 5.00 I= 0.75	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 5.00 I= 1.13	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.50 I= 1.13	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 17.50 I= 0.98	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 7.50 I= 1.13	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 5.00 I= 1.13	*ENTJ* N = 6 % = 15.00 I= 0.84	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	23	57.50	0.96
I	17	42.50	1.06
S	25	62.50	1.04
N	15	37.50	0.94
T	25	62.50	0.94
F	15	37.50	1.12
J	31	77.50	1.00
P	9	22.50	1.01
IJ	13	32.50	1.04
IP	4	10.00	1.13
EP	5	12.50	0.94
EJ	18	45.00	0.96
ST	16	40.00	1.00
SF	9	22.50	1.13
NF	6	15.00	1.13
NT	9	22.50	0.84
SJ	20	50.00	1.07
SP	5	12.50	0.94
NP	4	10.00	1.13
NJ	11	27.50	0.88
TJ	21	52.50	0.94
TP	4	10.00	0.90
FP	5	12.50	1.13
FJ	10	25.00	1.12
IN	4	10.00	0.90
EN	11	27.50	0.95
IS	13	32.50	1.12
ES	12	30.00	0.96

NOTES:

Table A-17

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Relationships with Co-Workers

N=42

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 14.29 I= 1.07	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 9.52 I= 1.07	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.38 I= 1.07	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 4.76 I= 0.71	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.38 I= 1.07	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.76 I= 1.07	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.38 I= 1.07	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 4.76 I= 0.71	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.76 I= 1.07	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.38 I= 1.07	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 16.67 I= 0.94	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 7.14 I= 1.07	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.76 I= 1.07	*ENTJ* N = 8 % =19.05 I= 1.07	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	25	59.52	0.99
I	17	40.48	1.01
S	25	59.52	0.99
N	17	40.48	1.01
T	27	64.29	0.96
F	15	35.71	1.07
J	33	78.57	1.01
P	9	21.43	0.96
IJ	13	30.95	0.99
IP	4	9.52	1.07
EP	5	11.90	0.89
EJ	20	47.62	1.02
ST	16	38.10	0.95
SF	9	21.43	1.07
NF	6	14.29	1.07
NT	11	26.19	0.98
SJ	20	47.62	1.02
SP	5	11.90	0.89
NP	4	9.52	1.07
NJ	13	30.95	0.99
TJ	23	54.76	0.99
TP	4	9.52	0.86
FP	5	11.90	1.07
FJ	10	23.81	1.07
IN	4	9.52	0.86
EN	13	30.95	1.07
IS	13	30.95	1.07
ES	12	28.57	0.92

NOTES:

Table A-18

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Other Communications with Clients

N=41

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 14.63 I= 1.10	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 9.76 I= 1.10	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.44 I= 1.10	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 4.88 I= 0.73	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.44 I= 1.10	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 4.88 I= 1.10	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.44 I= 1.10	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 4.88 I= 0.73	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 4.88 I= 1.10	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.44 I= 1.10	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 17.07 I= 0.96	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 7.32 I= 1.10	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 4.88 I= 1.10	*ENTJ* N = 7 % = 17.07 I= 0.96	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	24	58.54	0.98
I	17	41.46	1.04
S	25	60.98	1.02
N	16	39.02	0.98
T	26	63.41	0.95
F	15	36.59	1.10
J	32	78.05	1.00
P	9	21.95	0.99
IJ	13	31.71	1.02
IP	4	9.76	1.10
EP	5	12.20	0.91
EJ	19	46.34	0.99
ST	16	39.02	0.98
SF	9	21.95	1.10
NF	6	14.63	1.10
NT	10	24.39	0.91
SJ	20	48.78	1.05
SP	5	12.20	0.91
NP	4	9.76	1.10
NJ	12	29.27	0.94
TJ	22	53.66	0.97
TP	4	9.76	0.88
FP	5	12.20	1.10
FJ	10	24.39	1.10
IN	4	9.76	0.88
EN	12	29.27	1.01
IS	13	31.71	1.10
ES	12	29.27	0.94

NOTES:

Table A-19

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Technical Assistance to LEAs

N=39

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 6 % = 15.38 I= 1.15	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 10.26 I= 1.15	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 5.13 I= 0.77	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.56 I= 1.15	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 5.13 I= 1.15	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.56 I= 1.15	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 5.13 I= 0.77	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 5.13 I= 1.15	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.56 I= 1.15	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 8 % = 20.51 I= 1.15	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 7.69 I= 1.15	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 5.13 I= 1.15	*ENTJ* N = 5 % = 12.82 I= 0.72	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	23	58.97	0.98
I	16	41.03	1.03
S	26	66.67	1.11"
N	13	33.33	0.83"
T	25	64.10	0.96
F	14	35.90	1.08
J	30	76.92	0.99
P	9	23.08	1.04
IJ	12	30.77	0.99
IP	4	10.26	1.15
EP	5	12.82	0.96
EJ	18	46.15	0.99
ST	17	43.59	1.09
SF	9	23.08	1.15
NF	5	12.82	0.96
NT	8	20.51	0.77"
SJ	21	53.85	1.15"
SP	5	12.82	0.96
NP	4	10.26	1.15
NJ	9	23.08	0.74#
TJ	21	53.85	0.97
TP	4	10.26	0.92
FP	5	12.82	1.15
FJ	9	23.08	1.04
IN	3	7.69	0.69
EN	10	25.64	0.89
IS	13	33.33	1.15
ES	13	33.33	1.07

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.

Table A-20

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Quality of Treatment by Superiors

N=37

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 5 % = 13.51 I= 1.01	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 10.81 I= 1.22	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.70 I= 1.22	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 5.41 I= 0.81	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.70 I= 1.22	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 5.41 I= 1.22	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.70 I= 1.22	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 2.70 I= 0.41	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 5.41 I= 1.22	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.70 I= 1.22	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 5 % = 13.51 I= 0.76	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 8.11 I= 1.22	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 5.41 I= 1.22	*ENTJ* N = 7 % = 18.92 I= 1.06	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	21	56.76	0.95
I	16	43.24	1.08
S	21	56.76	0.95
N	16	43.24	1.08
T	22	59.46	0.89"
F	15	40.54	1.22"
J	29	78.38	1.01
P	8	21.62	0.97
IJ	12	32.43	1.04
IP	4	10.81	1.22
EP	4	10.81	0.81
EJ	17	45.95	0.98
ST	12	32.43	0.81"
SF	9	24.32	1.22
NF	6	16.22	1.22
NT	10	27.03	1.01
SJ	17	45.95	0.98
SP	4	10.81	0.81
NP	4	10.81	1.22
NJ	12	32.43	1.04
TJ	19	51.35	0.92
TP	3	8.11	0.73
FP	5	13.51	1.22
FJ	10	27.03	1.22
IN	4	10.81	0.97
EN	12	32.43	1.12
IS	12	32.43	1.12
ES	9	24.32	0.78"

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-21

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Travel on the Job

N=36

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 11.11 I= 0.83	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 11.11 I= 1.25	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.78 I= 1.25	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 5.56 I= 0.83	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.78 I= 1.25	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 5.56 I= 1.25	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.78 I= 1.25	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 5.56 I= 0.83	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 2.78 I= 0.63	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 19.44 I= 1.09	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 8.33 I= 1.25	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 5.56 I= 1.25	*ENTJ* N = 6 % = 16.67 I= 0.94	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	21	58.33	0.97
I	15	41.67	1.04
S	23	63.89	1.06
N	13	36.11	0.90
T	22	61.11	0.92
F	14	38.89	1.17
J	29	80.56	1.04
P	7	19.44	0.88
IJ	11	30.56	0.98
IP	4	11.11	1.25
EP	3	8.33	0.63
EJ	18	50.00	1.07
ST	14	38.89	0.97
SF	9	25.00	1.25
NF	5	13.89	1.04
NT	8	22.22	0.83
SJ	18	50.00	1.07
SP	5	13.89	1.04
NP	2	5.56	0.63
NJ	11	30.56	0.98
TJ	19	52.78	0.95
TP	3	8.33	0.75
FP	4	11.11	1.00
FJ	10	27.78	1.25
IN	4	11.11	1.00
EN	9	25.00	0.87
IS	11	30.56	1.06
ES	12	33.33	1.07

NOTES:

Table A-22

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Need for a Reliable Automobile

N=34

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 5.88 I= 0.44"	*ISFJ* N = 3 % = 8.82 I= 0.99	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	*INTJ* N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 0.44	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 5.83 I= 1.32	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 8.82 I= 1.32	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 5.88 I= 1.32	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.94 I= 1.32	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 6 % = 17.65 I= 0.99	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 8.82 I= 1.32	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 5.88 I= 1.32	*ENTJ* N = 6 % = 17.65 I= 0.99	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	23	67.65	1.13
I	11	32.35	0.81
S	20	58.82	0.98
N	14	41.18	1.03
T	20	58.82	0.88
F	14	41.18	1.24
J	24	70.59	0.91
P	10	29.41	1.32
IJ	7	20.59	0.66"
IP	4	11.76	1.32
EP	6	17.65	1.32
EJ	17	50.00	1.07
ST	12	35.29	0.88
SF	8	23.53	1.18
NF	6	17.65	1.32
NT	8	23.53	0.88
SJ	14	41.18	0.88
SP	6	17.65	1.32
NP	4	11.76	1.32
NJ	10	29.41	0.95
TJ	15	44.12	0.79"
TP	5	14.71	1.32
FP	5	14.71	1.32
FJ	9	26.47	1.19
IN	3	8.82	0.79
EN	11	32.35	1.12
IS	8	23.53	0.81
ES	12	35.29	1.13

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-23

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied with Job Security

N=35

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 11.43 I= 0.86	*ISFJ* N = 3 % = 8.57 I= 0.96	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 2.86 I= 1.29	*INTJ* N = 1 % = 2.86 I= 0.43	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 5.71 I= 1.29	*INFP* N = 1 % = 2.86 I= 1.29	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 5.71 I= 0.86	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 5.71 I= 1.29	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 2.86 I= 1.29	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 20.00 I= 1.12	*ESFJ* N = 3 % = 8.57 I= 1.29	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 5.71 I= 1.29	*ENTJ* N = 6 % =17.14 I= 0.96	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	23	65.71	1.10
I	12	34.29	0.86
S	21	60.00	1.00
N	14	40.00	1.00
T	21	60.00	0.90
F	14	40.00	1.20
J	27	77.14	0.99
P	8	22.86	1.03
IJ	9	25.71	0.83
IP	3	8.57	0.96
EP	5	14.29	1.07
EJ	18	51.43	1.10
ST	13	37.14	0.93
SF	8	22.86	1.14
NF	6	17.14	1.29
NT	8	22.86	0.86
SJ	17	48.57	1.04
SP	4	11.43	0.86
NP	4	11.43	1.29
NJ	10	28.57	0.92
TJ	18	51.43	0.93
TP	3	8.57	0.77
FP	5	14.29	1.29
FJ	9	25.71	1.16
IN	3	8.57	0.77
EN	11	31.43	1.09
IS	9	25.71	0.89
ES	12	34.29	1.10

NOTES:

Table A-24

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Satisfied
with Evaluations of Performance

N=32

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 12.50 I= 0.94	*ISFJ* N = 4 % = 12.50 I= 1.41	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 3.13 I= 1.41	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 6.25 I= 0.94	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 3.13 I= 1.41	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 6.25 I= 1.41	*INFP* N = 1 % = 3.13 I= 1.41	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 3.13 I= 0.47	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 6.25 I= 1.41	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 3.13 I= 1.41	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 5 % = 15.63 I= 0.88	*ESFJ* N = 2 % = 6.25 I= 0.94	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 6.25 I= 1.41	*ENTJ* N = 4 % =12.50 I= 0.70	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	17	53.13	0.89
I	15	46.88	1.17
S	19	59.38	0.99
N	13	40.63	1.02
T	18	56.25	0.84"
F	14	43.75	1.31"
J	24	75.00	0.96
P	8	25.00	1.13
IJ	11	34.38	1.10
IP	4	12.50	1.41
EP	4	12.50	0.94
EJ	13	40.63	0.87
ST	11	34.38	0.86
SF	8	25.00	1.25
NF	6	18.75	1.41
NT	7	21.88	0.82
SJ	15	46.88	1.00
SP	4	12.50	0.94
NP	4	12.50	1.41
NJ	9	28.13	0.90
TJ	15	46.88	0.84
TP	3	9.38	0.84
FP	5	15.63	1.41
FJ	9	28.13	1.27
IN	4	12.50	1.13
EN	9	28.13	0.97
IS	11	34.38	1.19
ES	8	25.00	0.80

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-25

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied with Merit Pay

N=29

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 5 % = 17.24 I= 1.29	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0"	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 3 % =10.34 I= 1.55	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 3.45 I= 1.55	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 6.90 I= 1.55	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 10.34 I= 1.55	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 3.45 I= 0.78	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 24.14 I= 1.36	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 3.45 I= 0.52	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 6 % =20.69 I= 1.16	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	18	62.07	1.03
I	11	37.93	0.95
S	19	65.52	1.09
N	10	34.48	0.86
T	25	86.21	1.29*
F	4	13.79	0.41*
J	22	75.86	0.98
P	7	24.14	1.09
IJ	8	27.59	0.89
IP	3	10.34	1.16
EP	4	13.79	1.03
EJ	14	48.28	1.03
ST	16	55.17	1.38#
SF	3	10.34	0.52"
NF	1	3.45	0.26"
NT	9	31.03	1.16
SJ	13	44.83	0.96
SP	6	20.69	1.55
NP	1	3.45	0.39
NJ	9	31.03	1.00
TJ	21	72.41	1.30#
TP	4	13.79	1.24
FP	3	10.34	0.93
FJ	1	3.45	0.16*
IN	3	10.34	0.93
EN	7	24.14	0.84
IS	8	27.59	0.95
ES	11	37.93	1.22

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-26

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types: All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied with Salary

N=23

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 17.39 I= 1.30	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0"	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 3 % =13.04 I= 1.96	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 8.70 I= 1.96	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 4.35 I= 0.65	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.35 I= 0.98	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 6 % = 26.09 I= 1.47	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 4.35 I= 0.65	*ENFJ* N = 1 % = 4.35 I= 0.98	*ENTJ* N = 4 % =17.39 I= 0.98	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	14	60.87	1.01
I	9	39.13	0.98
S	14	60.87	1.01
N	9	39.13	0.98
T	18	78.26	1.17
F	5	21.74	0.65
J	19	82.61	1.06
P	4	17.39	0.78
IJ	7	30.43	0.98
IP	2	8.70	0.98
EP	2	8.70	0.65
EJ	12	52.17	1.12
ST	11	47.83	1.20
SF	3	13.04	0.65
NF	2	8.70	0.65
NT	7	30.43	1.14
SJ	11	47.83	1.02
SP	3	13.04	0.98
NP	1	4.35	0.49
NJ	8	34.78	1.12
TJ	17	73.91	1.33"
TP	1	4.35	0.39
FP	3	13.04	1.17
FJ	2	8.70	0.39"
IN	3	13.04	1.17
EN	6	26.09	0.90
IS	6	26.09	0.90
ES	8	34.78	1.12

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-27

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied
with Travel Budget to Do the Job

N=22

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 18.18 I= 1.36	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 0.51	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 1.36	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 2.05	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 1.02	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 31.82 I= 1.79"	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 0.68	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 4 % = 18.18 I= 1.02	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	13	59.09	0.98
I	9	40.91	1.02
S	15	68.18	1.14
N	7	31.82	0.80
T	17	77.27	1.16
F	5	22.73	0.68
J	19	86.36	1.11
P	3	13.64	0.61
IJ	7	31.82	1.02
IP	2	9.09	1.02
EP	1	4.55	0.34
EJ	12	54.55	1.17
ST	11	50.00	1.25
SF	4	18.18	0.91
NF	1	4.55	0.34
NT	6	27.27	1.02
SJ	13	59.09	1.27
SP	2	9.09	0.68
NP	1	4.55	0.51
NJ	6	27.27	0.88
TJ	17	77.27	1.39#
TP	0	0.0	0.0 "
FP	3	13.64	1.23
FJ	2	9.09	0.41
IN	2	9.09	0.82
EN	5	22.73	0.79
IS	7	31.82	1.10
ES	8	36.36	1.17

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.

Table A-28

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied
with Opportunity for Promotion

N=21

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 19.05 I= 1.43	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 3 % =14.29 I= 2.14	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 2.14	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 2.14	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 0.71	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 2.14	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 5 % = 23.81 I= 1.34	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 0.71	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 3 % =14.29 I= 0.80	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	12	57.14	0.95
I	9	42.86	1.07
S	12	57.14	0.95
N	9	42.86	1.07
T	17	80.95	1.21
F	4	19.05	0.57
J	16	76.19	0.98
P	5	23.81	1.07
IJ	7	33.33	1.07
IP	2	9.52	1.07
EP	3	14.29	1.07
EJ	9	42.86	0.92
ST	11	52.38	1.31
SF	1	4.76	0.24"
NF	3	14.29	1.07
NT	6	28.57	1.07
SJ	10	47.62	1.02
SP	2	9.52	0.71
NP	3	14.29	1.61
NJ	6	28.57	0.92
TJ	15	71.43	1.29"
TP	2	9.52	0.86
FP	3	14.29	1.29
FJ	1	4.76	0.21"
IN	4	19.05	1.71
EN	5	23.81	0.82
IS	5	23.81	0.82
ES	7	33.33	1.07

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-29

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied with Job Orientation

N-21

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 19.05 I= 1.43	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 0.54	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 2.14	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 1.43	JUDGING INTROVERTS
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 3 % = 14.29 I= 2.14	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 4.76 I= 1.07	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 3 % = 14.29 I= 0.80	*ESFJ* N = 2 % = 9.52 I= 1.43	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 4 % =19.05 I= 1.07	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	13	61.90	1.03
I	8	38.10	0.95
S	13	61.90	1.03
N	8	38.10	0.95
T	16	76.19	1.14
F	5	23.81	0.71
J	17	80.95	1.04
P	4	19.05	0.86
IJ	8	38.10	1.22
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	4	19.05	1.43
EJ	9	42.86	0.92
ST	10	47.62	1.19
SF	3	14.29	0.71
NF	2	9.52	0.71
NT	6	28.57	1.07
SJ	10	47.62	1.02
SP	3	14.29	1.07
NP	1	4.76	0.54
NJ	7	33.33	1.07
TJ	13	61.90	1.11
TP	3	14.29	1.29
FP	1	4.76	0.43
FJ	4	19.05	0.86
IN	3	14.29	1.29
EN	5	23.81	0.82
IS	5	23.81	0.82
ES	8	38.10	1.22

NOTES:

Table A-30

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied
with Out-of-State Travel Policies

N=20

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 5 % = 25.00 I= 1.88	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 10.00 I= 1.50	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 5.00 I= 0.75	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 5.00 I= 2.25	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 7 % = 35.00 I= 1.97"	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 4 % = 20.00 I= 1.12	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	13	65.00	1.08
I	7	35.00	0.88
S	13	65.00	1.08
N	7	35.00	0.87
T	20	*****	1.50*
F	0	0.0	0.0 *
J	18	90.00	1.16
P	2	10.00	0.45
IJ	7	35.00	1.13
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	2	10.00	0.75
EJ	11	55.00	1.18
ST	13	65.00	1.62#
SF	0	0.0	0.0 #
NF	0	0.0	0.0 "
NT	7	35.00	1.31
SJ	12	60.00	1.29
SP	1	5.00	0.38
NP	1	5.00	0.56
NJ	6	30.00	0.96
TJ	18	90.00	1.62*
TP	2	10.00	0.90
FP	0	0.0	0.0
FJ	0	0.0	0.0 #
IN	2	10.00	0.90
EN	5	25.00	0.87
IS	5	25.00	0.87
ES	8	40.00	1.29

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-31

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied
with Communications in the Organization

N=22

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 4 % = 18.18 I= 1.36	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 0.51	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 1.36	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 2.05	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 0.68	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 2 % = 9.09 I= 2.05	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 4 % = 18.18 I= 1.02	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 4.55 I= 0.68	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 6 % =27.27 I= 1.53	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	14	63.64	1.06
I	8	36.36	0.91
S	11	50.00	0.83
N	11	50.00	1.25
T	17	77.27	1.16
F	5	22.73	0.68
J	18	81.82	1.05
P	4	18.18	0.82
IJ	7	31.82	1.02
IP	1	4.55	0.51
EP	3	13.64	1.02
EJ	11	50.00	1.07
ST	9	40.91	1.02
SF	2	9.09	0.45
NF	3	13.64	1.02
NT	8	36.36	1.36
SJ	10	45.45	0.97
SP	1	4.55	0.34
NP	3	13.64	1.53
NJ	8	36.36	1.17
TJ	16	72.73	1.31"
TP	1	4.55	0.41
FP	3	13.64	1.23
FJ	2	9.09	0.41
IN	3	13.64	1.23
EN	8	36.36	1.26
IS	5	22.73	0.79
ES	6	27.27	0.88

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-32

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants
Dissatisfied with Fringe Benefits

N=14

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 14.29 I= 1.07	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % =14.29 I= 2.14	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 1 % = 7.14 I= 1.61	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 7.14 I= 1.07	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 5 % = 35.71 I= 2.01"	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 7.14 I= 1.07	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 2 % =14.29 I= 0.80	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	9	64.29	1.07
I	5	35.71	0.89
S	10	71.43	1.19
N	4	28.57	0.71
T	12	85.71	1.29
F	2	14.29	0.43
J	12	85.71	1.10
P	2	14.29	0.64
IJ	4	28.57	0.92
IP	1	7.14	0.80
EP	1	7.14	0.54
EJ	8	57.14	1.22
ST	8	57.14	1.43
SF	2	14.29	0.71
NF	0	0.0	0.0
NT	4	28.57	1.07
SJ	8	57.14	1.22
SP	2	14.29	1.07
NP	0	0.0	0.0
NJ	4	28.57	0.92
TJ	11	78.57	1.41
TP	1	7.14	0.64
FP	1	7.14	0.64
FJ	1	7.14	0.32
IN	2	14.29	1.29
EN	2	14.29	0.49
IS	3	21.43	0.74
ES	7	50.00	1.61

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-33

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied
with Reimbursement System for Travel

N=15

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 13.33 I= 1.00	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 6.67 I= 0.75	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 13.33 I= 2.00	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 6.67 I= 3.00	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 13.33 I= 3.00	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 6.67 I= 1.50	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTJ N = 3 % = 20.00 I= 1.12	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 3 % =20.00 I= 1.12	JUDGING

INTROVERTS

EXTRAVERTS

	N	%	I
E	7	46.67	0.78
I	8	53.33	1.33
S	9	60.00	1.00
N	6	40.00	1.00
T	11	73.33	1.10
F	4	26.67	0.80
J	11	73.33	0.94
P	4	26.67	1.20
IJ	5	33.33	1.07
IP	3	20.00	2.25
EP	1	6.67	0.50
EJ	6	40.00	0.86
ST	6	40.00	1.00
SF	3	20.00	1.00
NF	1	6.67	0.50
NT	5	33.33	1.25
SJ	6	40.00	0.86
SP	3	20.00	1.50
NP	1	6.67	0.75
NJ	5	33.33	1.07
TJ	10	66.67	1.20
TP	1	6.67	0.60
FP	3	20.00	1.80
FJ	1	6.67	0.30
IN	2	13.33	1.20
EN	4	26.67	0.92
IS	6	40.00	1.38
ES	3	20.00	0.64

NOTES:

Table A-34

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants Dissatisfied
with Organizational Structure

N=16

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 3 % = 18.75 I= 1.41	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 0.70	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % =12.50 I= 1.88	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.81	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 0.94	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 6.25 I= 2.81	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 4 % = 25.00 I= 1.41	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 3 % =18.75 I= 1.05	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	9	56.25	0.94
I	7	43.75	1.09
S	9	56.25	0.94
N	7	43.75	1.09
T	14	87.50	1.31"
F	2	12.50	0.38"
J	13	81.25	1.04
P	3	18.75	0.84
IJ	6	37.50	1.21
IP	1	6.25	0.70
EP	2	12.50	0.94
EJ	7	43.75	0.94
ST	8	50.00	1.25
SF	1	6.25	0.31
NF	1	6.25	0.47
NT	6	37.50	1.41
SJ	8	50.00	1.07
SP	1	6.25	0.47
NP	2	12.50	1.41
NJ	5	31.25	1.00
TJ	12	75.00	1.35
TP	2	12.50	1.13
FP	1	6.25	0.56
FJ	1	6.25	0.28
IN	3	18.75	1.69
EN	4	25.00	0.87
IS	4	25.00	0.87
ES	5	31.25	1.00

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-35

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants More Effective and More Satisfied

N=10

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N = 1 % = 10.00 I= 0.75	N = 2 % = 20.00 I= 2.25	N = 1 % = 10.00 I= 4.50	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	INTROVERTS
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 1 % =10.00 I= 4.50	PERCEPTIVE
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	EXTRAVERTS
N = 2 % = 20.00 I= 1.12	N = 1 % = 10.00 I= 1.50	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 2 % =20.00 I= 1.12	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	6	60.00	1.00
I	4	40.00	1.00
S	6	60.00	1.00
N	4	40.00	1.00
T	6	60.00	0.90
F	4	40.00	1.20
J	9	90.00	1.16
P	1	10.00	0.45
IJ	4	40.00	1.29
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	1	10.00	0.75
EJ	5	50.00	1.07
ST	3	30.00	0.75
SF	3	30.00	1.50
NF	1	10.00	0.75
NT	3	30.00	1.12
SJ	6	60.00	1.29
SP	0	0.0	0.0
NP	1	10.00	1.13
NJ	3	30.00	0.96
TJ	5	50.00	0.90
TP	1	10.00	0.90
FP	0	0.0	0.0
FJ	4	40.00	1.80
IN	1	10.00	0.90
EN	3	30.00	1.04
IS	3	30.00	1.04
ES	3	30.00	0.96

NOTES:

Table A-36

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants
More Effective and Less Satisfied

N=13

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 15.38 I= 1.15	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 7.69 I= 0.87	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 1 % = 7.69 I= 1.15	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 7.69 I= 1.15	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 7.69 I= 1.73	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 4 % = 30.77 I= 1.73	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 3 % =23.08 I= 1.30	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	9	69.23	1.15
I	4	30.77	0.77
S	8	61.54	1.03
N	5	38.46	0.96
T	11	84.62	1.27
F	2	15.38	0.46
J	11	84.62	1.09
P	2	15.38	0.69
IJ	4	30.77	0.99
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	2	15.38	1.15
EJ	7	53.85	1.15
ST	7	53.85	1.35
SF	1	7.69	0.38
NF	1	7.69	0.58
NT	4	30.77	1.15
SJ	7	53.85	1.15
SP	1	7.69	0.58
NP	1	7.69	0.87
NJ	4	30.77	0.99
TJ	10	76.92	1.38
TP	1	7.69	0.69
FP	1	7.69	0.69
FJ	1	7.69	0.35
IN	1	7.69	0.69
EN	4	30.77	1.07
IS	3	23.08	0.80
ES	5	38.46	1.24

NOTES:

Table A-37

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants
Less Effective and More Satisfied

N-12

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 1 % = 8.33 I= 0.63	*ISFJ* N = 1 % = 8.33 I= 0.94	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 1 % = 8.33 I= 3.75	*ISFP* N = 2 % = 16.67 I= 3.75	*INFP* N = 1 % = 8.33 I= 3.75	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 1 % = 8.33 I= 1.88	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFJ* N = 2 % = 16.67 I= 2.50	*ENFJ* N = 2 % = 16.67 I= 3.75	*ENTJ* N = 1 % = 8.33 I= 0.47	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	6	50.00	0.83
I	6	50.00	1.25
S	7	58.33	0.97
N	5	41.67	1.04
T	3	25.00	0.38*
F	9	75.00	2.25*
J	7	58.33	0.75
P	5	41.67	1.88
IJ	2	16.67	0.54
IP	4	33.33	3.75#
EP	1	8.33	0.63
EJ	5	41.67	0.89
ST	2	16.67	0.42
SF	5	41.67	2.08"
NF	4	33.33	2.50"
NT	1	8.33	0.31
SJ	4	33.33	0.71
SP	3	25.00	1.87
NP	2	16.67	1.87
NJ	3	25.00	0.80
TJ	2	16.67	0.30#
TP	1	8.33	0.75
FP	4	33.33	3.00"
FJ	5	41.67	1.87
IN	1	8.33	0.75
EN	4	33.33	1.15
IS	5	41.67	1.44
ES	2	16.67	0.54

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-38

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
All Consultants and Consultants
Less Effective and Less Satisfied

N=9

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 1 % = 11.11 I= 0.83	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % = 22.22 I= 3.33	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 22.22 I= 3.33	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 2 % = 22.22 I= 1.25	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 2 % = 22.22 I= 1.25	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	6	66.67	1.11
I	3	33.33	0.83
S	5	55.56	0.93
N	4	44.44	1.11
T	9	*****	1.50"
F	0	0.0	0.0 "
J	7	77.78	1.00
P	2	22.22	1.00
IJ	3	33.33	1.07
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	2	22.22	1.67
EJ	4	44.44	0.95
ST	5	55.56	1.39
SF	0	0.0	0.0
NF	0	0.0	0.0
NT	4	44.44	1.67
SJ	3	33.33	0.71
SP	2	22.22	1.67
NP	0	0.0	0.0
NJ	4	44.44	1.43
TJ	7	77.78	1.40
TP	2	22.22	2.00
FP	0	0.0	0.0
FJ	0	0.0	0.0
IN	2	22.22	2.00
EN	2	22.22	0.77
IS	1	11.11	0.38
ES	4	44.44	1.43

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.

Table A-39

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants
More Effective and More Satisfied

N=8

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFJ* N = 2 % = 25.00 I= 2.83	*INFJ* N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 4.25	*INTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 4.25	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 0.61	*ESFJ* N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 1.42	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 2 % = 25.00 I= 2.13	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	5	62.50	1.06
I	3	37.50	0.91
S	4	50.00	0.74
N	4	50.00	1.55
T	4	50.00	0.77
F	4	50.00	1.42
J	7	87.50	1.10
P	1	12.50	0.61
IJ	3	37.50	1.16
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	1	12.50	1.06
EJ	4	50.00	1.06
ST	1	12.50	0.28
SF	3	37.50	1.59
NF	1	12.50	1.06
NT	3	37.50	1.82
SJ	4	50.00	0.94
SP	0	0.0	0.0
NP	1	12.50	2.13
NJ	3	37.50	1.42
TJ	3	37.50	0.71
TP	1	12.50	1.06
FP	0	0.0	0.0
FJ	4	50.00	1.89
IN	1	12.50	1.06
EN	3	37.50	1.82
IS	2	25.00	0.85
ES	2	25.00	0.65

NOTES:

Table A-40

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants
More Effective and Less Satisfied

N=7

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 2 % = 28.57 I= 1.94	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 1 % = 14.29 I= 1.62	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 4 % = 57.14 I= 2.78"	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	5	71.43	1.21
I	2	28.57	0.69
S	7	*****	1.48
N	0	0.0	0.0
T	7	*****	1.55
F	0	0.0	0.0
J	6	85.71	1.08
P	1	14.29	0.69
IJ	2	28.57	0.88
IP	0	0.0	0.0
EP	1	14.29	1.21
EJ	4	57.14	1.21
ST	7	*****	2.27#
SF	0	0.0	0.0
NF	0	0.0	0.0
NT	0	0.0	0.0
SJ	6	85.71	1.62
SP	1	14.29	0.97
NP	0	0.0	0.0
NJ	0	0.0	0.0
TJ	6	85.71	1.62
TP	1	14.29	1.21
FP	0	0.0	0.0
FJ	0	0.0	0.0
IN	0	0.0	0.0
EN	0	0.0	0.0
IS	2	28.57	0.97
ES	5	71.43	1.87

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.

Table A-41

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants
Less Effective and More Satisfied

N=8

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ	*ISFJ*	*INFJ*	*INTJ*	JUDGING
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 1.42	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	
ISTP	*ISFP*	*INFP*	*INTP*	INTROVERTS
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 2.13	N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 4.25	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE
ESTP	*ESFP*	*ENFP*	*ENTP*	PERCEPTIVE
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ	*ESFJ*	*ENFJ*	*ENTJ*	JUDGING
N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	N = 2 % = 25.00 I= 2.83	N = 2 % = 25.00 I= 4.25"	N = 1 % = 12.50 I= 1.06	

	N	%	I
E	5	62.50	1.06
I	3	37.50	0.91
S	4	50.00	0.74
N	4	50.00	1.55
T	1	12.50	0.19*
F	7	87.50	2.48*
J	6	75.00	0.94
P	2	25.00	1.21
IJ	1	12.50	0.39
IP	2	25.00	2.83
EP	0	0.0	0.0
EJ	5	62.50	1.33
ST	0	0.0	0.0 #
SF	4	50.00	2.13
NF	3	37.50	3.19"
NT	1	12.50	0.61
SJ	3	37.50	0.71
SP	1	12.50	0.85
NP	1	12.50	2.13
NJ	3	37.50	1.42
TJ	1	12.50	0.24"
TP	0	0.0	0.0
FP	2	25.00	2.83
FJ	5	62.50	2.36"
IN	1	12.50	1.06
EN	3	37.50	1.82
IS	2	25.00	0.85
ES	2	25.00	0.65

NOTES: " implies significance at the .05 level.
implies significance at the .01 level.
* implies significance at the .001 level.

Table A-42

SRTT Comparisons of Frequency Distribution of MBTI Types:
Incumbents and Incumbent Consultants
Less Effective and Less Satisfied

N=9

SENSING TYPES with THINKING	SENSING TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with FEELING	INTUITIVE TYPES with THINKING	
ISTJ N = 1 % = 11.11 I= 0.76	*ISFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTJ* N = 2 % =22.22 I= 3.78	JUDGING
ISTP N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ISFP* N = 1 % =11.11 I= 1.89	*INFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*INTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	INTROVERTS PERCEPTIVE
ESTP N = 2 % = 22.22 I= 2.52	*ESFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTP* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	PERCEPTIVE EXTRAVERTS
ESTJ N = 2 % = 22.22 I= 1.08	*ESFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENFJ* N = 0 % = 0.0 I= 0.0	*ENTJ* N = 1 % =11.11 I= 0.94	JUDGING

	N	%	I
E	5	55.56	0.94
I	4	44.44	1.08
S	6	66.67	0.99
N	3	33.33	1.03
T	8	88.89	1.37
F	1	11.11	0.31
J	6	66.67	0.84
P	3	33.33	1.62
IJ	3	33.33	1.03
IP	1	11.11	1.26
EP	2	22.22	1.89
EJ	3	33.33	0.71
ST	5	55.56	1.26
SF	1	11.11	0.47
NF	0	0.0	0.0
NT	3	33.33	1.62
SJ	3	33.33	0.63
SP	3	33.33	2.27
NP	0	0.0	0.0
NJ	3	33.33	1.26
TJ	6	66.67	1.26
TP	2	22.22	1.89
FP	1	11.11	1.26
FJ	0	0.0	0.0
IN	2	22.22	1.89
EN	1	11.11	0.54
IS	2	22.22	0.76
ES	4	44.44	1.16

NOTES:

APPENDIX B
CHI-SQUARE COMPARISONS OF EDUCATOR GROUPS

Table B-1

Chi Square of MBTI Type Table Quadrants for Difference Between the Total Sample Population of Regional Consultants and a Sample of High School Teachers

MBTI Indices	MBTI Frequencies	Regional consultants N	High school teachers N	Total f_o N
IS	f_o	13	123	136
	f_e	13.0	123.0	
IN	f_o	5	85	90
	f_e	8.6	81.4	
ES	f_o	14	96	110
	f_e	10.5	99.5	
EN	f_o	13	122	135
	f_e	12.9	122.1	
Total f_o		45	426	471

χ^2=2.95.
df=3.
Significance ≠.

Table B-2

Chi Square of MBTI Type Table Quadrants for Difference Between the Total Sample Population of Regional Consultants and a Sample of Secondary Supervisory Teachers

MBTI Indices	MBTI Frequencies	Regional consultants N	Secondary supervisory teachers N	Total f_o N
IS	f_o	13	24	37
	f_e	12.9	24.1	
IN	f_o	5	12	17
	f_e	5.9	13.8	
ES	f_o	14	28	42
	f_e	14.6	27.3	
EN	f_o	13	20	33
	f_e	11.5	21.5	
Total f_o		45	84	129

χ^2=.71.
df=3.
Significance ≠.

Table B-3

Chi Square of MBTI Type Table Quadrants for Difference Between the Total Sample Population of Regional Consultants and a Sample of Adult Education Teachers

MBTI Indices	MBTI Frequencies	Regional consultants N	Adult education teachers N	Total f_o N
IS	f_o	13	57	70
	f_e	13.6	56.4	
IN	f_o	5	25	30
	f_e	5.8	24.2	
ES	f_o	14	63	77
	f_e	15.0	62.0	
EN	f_o	13	41	54
	f_e	10.5	43.5	
Total f_o		45	186	231

χ^2=1.61.
df=3.
Significance ≠.

Table B-4

Chi Square of MBTI Type Table Quadrants for Difference Between the Total Sample Population of Regional Consultants and a Sample of Trade, Industrial, and Technical Teachers

MBTI Indices	MBTI Frequencies	Regional consultants N	Trade, industrial, and technical teachers N	Total f_o N
IS	f_o	13	19	32
	f_e	17.8	14.2	
IN	f_o	5	5	10
	f_e	5.6	4.4	
ES	f_o	14	5	19
	f_e	10.6	8.4	
EN	f_o	13	7	20
	f_e	11.1	8.9	
Total f_o		45	36	81

χ^2=6.24.
df=3.
Significance ≠.

APPENDIX C
JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE_____

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR FEELINGS OF JOB SATISFACTION RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING JOB CHARACTERISTICS BY PLACING AN 'X' IN THE SPACE WHICH MOST NEARLY REPRESENTS YOUR FEELING ABOUT THE OVERALL EFFECTS OF THAT CHARACTERISTIC.

Scale:
- Very Dissatisfied -2
- Dissatisfied -1
- Neutral 0
- Satisfied +1
- Very Satisfied +2

JOB CHARACTERISTICS	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
1. Physical working conditions					
2. Travel on the job					
3. Extent of absence from home					
4. Need for a reliable automobile					
5. Travel budget to do the job					
6. Travel reimbursement rate					
7. Reimbursement system for travel					
8. Job orientation					
9. Salary					
10. Fringe benefits					
11. Merit pay					
12. Job security					
13. Leave policies					
14. Opportunity for promotion					
15. Work hours					
16. Volume of work					
17. Personal contacts w/clients					
18. Other communications w/clients					

		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
19.	Technical assistance to LEAs - -					
20.	VSO Activities - all levels - -					
21.	Assessing educational programs - -					
22.	Diffusing educational products - -					
23.	Unanticipated job tasks - - -					
24.	Federal funding activities - -					
25.	Organizing & conducting workshops -					
26.	Staff development - - - -					
27.	Out-of-state travel policies - -					
28.	Amount of supervision - - -					
29.	Recognition for accomplishments - -					
30.	Support services (sec.,tel.,print.) -					
31.	Evaluations of your performance - -					
32.	Quality of treatment by superiors -					
33.	Office routine - - - -					
34.	Regional staff meetings - - -					
35.	Discipline unit meetings - - -					
36.	Section & division meetings - -					
37.	Organizational structure - - -					
38.	Communication flow in the organization -					
39.	Relationships w/co-workers - -					
40.	Most of the time how do you feel about your job in terms of satisfaction? -					
41.	Please add any unlisted job characteristics which are important to you and evaluate them. _____					

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Arthur Burton Haseltine is a native Floridian who earned his Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering degree at North Carolina State University and his Master of Education degree, with a major in technical education, at the University of Florida. Additional work was accomplished in the service schools of the U.S. Navy.

Occupational efforts have been dedicated to three major career fields over a period of more than 40 years. As an engineer in industry he was affiliated with American Enka Corporation as a design engineer and in mechanical research for more than 10 years. He served in World War II, the Korean War, and the Viet Nam War as a Naval officer and pilot. For the past 12 years, he has been involved with education as chairman of aerospace and design programs in the junior college system and as a consultant with the Florida Department of Education, a position he left in 1981.

He was married to the late Lallafaye Sides and has two daughters.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ralph B. Kimbrough

Ralph B. Kimbrough, Chairman
Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Phillip A. Clark

Phillip A. Clark
Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James W. Hensel

James W. Hensel
Professor of Instructional
Leadership and Support

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August, 1982

Dean for Graduate Studies and
Research